

# BSΔEs and BSDEs with non-Lipschitz drivers: comparison, convergence and robustness

Patrick Cheridito <sup>\*</sup>  
ORFE  
Princeton University  
Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

Mitja Stadje <sup>†</sup>  
Eurandom  
Eindhoven University of Technology  
5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands

January 2010

## Abstract

We provide existence results and comparison principles for solutions of backward stochastic difference equations (BSΔEs) and then prove convergence of these to solutions of backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs) when the mesh size of the time-discretization goes to zero. The BSΔEs and BSDEs are governed by drivers  $f^N(t, \omega, y, z)$  and  $f(t, \omega, y, z)$ , respectively. The new feature of this paper is that they may be non-Lipschitz in  $z$ . For the convergence results it is assumed that the BSΔEs are based on  $d$ -dimensional random walks  $W^N$  approximating the  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion  $W$  underlying the BSDE and that  $f^N$  converges to  $f$ . Conditions are given under which for any terminal condition  $\xi$ , there exist terminal conditions  $\xi^N$  for the sequence of BSΔEs, converging to  $\xi$  in  $L^2$ , such that for the solutions  $Y^N$  and  $Y$  of the corresponding BSΔEs and the limiting BSDE one has  $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_t^N - Y_t| \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^2$ . An important special case is when  $f^N(t, \omega, y, z)$  and  $f(t, \omega, y, z)$  are convex in  $z$ . We show that in this situation,  $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_t^N - Y_t| \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^2$  for every sequence of discrete terminal conditions  $\xi^N$  converging to  $\xi$  in  $L^2$ . As a consequence, one obtains that the BSDE is robust in the sense that if  $(W^N, \xi^N)$  is close to  $(W, \xi)$  in distribution, then  $Y^N$  is close to  $Y$  in distribution too.

**Keywords** Backward stochastic difference equations, backward stochastic differential equations, comparison principle, convergence, robustness

**AMS Subject Classification** 60H10, 60Fxx

## 1 Introduction

The aim of this paper is to obtain convergence results of solutions of stochastic backward equations in discrete time (BSΔEs) to solutions of stochastic backward equations in continuous time (BSDEs). The discrete equations are governed by drivers  $f^N(t, \omega, y, z)$ ,  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , and the continuous one by  $f(t, \omega, y, z)$ . The new feature of this paper is that  $f^N$  and  $f$  may be non-Lipschitz in  $z$ . To obtain convergence results we assume that the BSΔEs are based on  $d$ -dimensional random walks  $W^N$  converging to the  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion  $W$  underlying the BSDE and that  $f^N$  tends to  $f$ . Convergence results for Lipschitz drivers have been obtained by Briand et al. (2001, 2002) as well as Toldo (2006, 2007).

---

<sup>\*</sup>Supported by NSF Grant DMS-0642361.

<sup>†</sup>Supported by NSF Grant DMS-0642361.

In these papers, existence and uniqueness of solutions follow from a Picard iteration argument. Using results on convergence of filtrations from Coquet et al. (2000), it can then be shown that the Picard sequences approach each other asymptotically, which yields general convergence results. In the case of non-Lipschitz drivers this approach does not work, and neither the existence of solutions of BSΔEs nor their convergence to their counterparts in continuous time are clear.

In this paper we start with a careful analysis of BSΔEs. Central to our approach is Theorem 4.2 which provides a comparison principle for BSΔEs. It requires drivers that can grow faster than linearly but strictly less than quadratically in  $z$ . Our main convergence results are Theorems 5.9 and 6.5. Theorem 5.9 shows that if  $f$  grows less than quadratically in  $z$ , then for any terminal condition  $\xi$  there exist terminal conditions  $\xi^N$  for the sequence of BSΔEs, converging to  $\xi$  in  $L^2$ , such that for the solutions  $Y^N$  and  $Y$  of the corresponding BSΔEs and the limiting BSDE one has

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_t^N - Y_t| \xrightarrow{(N \rightarrow \infty)} 0 \quad \text{in } L^2. \quad (1.1)$$

Furthermore, if  $\xi$  is of the form  $\xi = \varphi(W_{s_1}, \dots, W_{s_n})$  for a uniformly continuous function  $\varphi$ , then the  $\xi^N$  can be chosen as  $\xi^N = \varphi(W_{s_1}^N, \dots, W_{s_n}^N)$ . In Theorem 6.5 we prove that if  $f(t, \omega, y, z)$  is also assumed to be convex in  $z$ , then (1.1) holds for every sequence  $\xi^N$  of discrete-time terminal conditions converging in  $L^2$  to the continuous-time terminal condition  $\xi$ . As a corollary one obtains that if  $(W^N, \xi^N)$  is close to  $(W, \xi)$  in distribution, then  $Y^N$  is close to  $Y$  in distribution too.

A survey of BSDEs with Lipschitz drivers is given in the paper El Karoui et al. (1997). Kobylanski (2000) extended the theory of one-dimensional BSDEs to drivers with quadratic growth and bounded terminal conditions. Briand and Hu (2006, 2008) showed existence of solutions of BSDEs with drivers of quadratic growth and unbounded terminal conditions with exponential moments. Morlais (2009) relaxed some of the differentiability assumptions that Kobylanski (2000) had put on the drivers. Discrete schemes for the approximation of solutions of BSDEs have been studied by a number of authors; see for instance, Ma et al. (1994), Douglas et al. (1996), Bally (1997), Chevance (1997), Coquet et al. (1999), Ma et al. (2002), Zhang and Zheng (2002), Zhang (2004), Bouchard and Touzi (2004), Gobet et al. (2005) and Otmani (2006). However, in all these papers the drivers are assumed to be Lipschitz. Recently, Imkeller and Reis (2009) proved convergence of solutions to BSDEs with a truncated driver to the solutions of BSDEs with drivers of quadratic growth in  $z$ .

The structure of our paper is as follows: In Sections 2 we introduce the notation and provide some background material. Then we give an example showing that BSΔEs with non-Lipschitz drivers need not converge if the terminal conditions are not uniformly bounded. In Section 3 we show that BSΔEs admit solutions under very mild assumptions. In Section 4 we first provide an example that shows that a general comparison principle for BSΔEs with drivers of quadratic growth cannot hold. Then we prove a comparison principle for subquadratic BSΔEs. Section 5 gives convergence results of solutions of general BSΔEs to solutions of BSDEs, and in Section 6 we prove convergence results for drivers that are convex in  $z$ .

## 2 Notation and setup

We fix a finite time horizon  $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . As underlying process for the limiting BSDE in continuous time we take a  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion  $(W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and denote by  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  the augmented filtration generated by  $(W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ . Equalities and inequalities between random variables are, as usual, understood in the  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost sure sense. As approximating processes

we consider a sequence  $(W_t^N)_{t \in [0, T]}$ ,  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , of  $d$ -dimensional square-integrable martingales starting at 0 with independent increments fulfilling the following three assumptions:

(A1) For every  $N$  there exists a finite sequence  $0 = t_0^N < t_1^N < \dots < t_{i_N}^N = T$  satisfying

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_i |t_{i+1}^N - t_i^N| = 0$$

such that  $W_t^N$  is constant on each of the intervals  $[t_i^N, t_{i+1}^N)$ .

(A2)

$$\Delta \langle W^{N,k} \rangle_{t_i^N} = \Delta \langle W^{N,l} \rangle_{t_i^N} > 0 \quad \text{for all } i \text{ and } 1 \leq k, l \leq d.$$

(A3)

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |W_t^N - W_t|^2 \right] = 0$$

where  $|\cdot|$  denotes the standard Euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ :  $|x| = (\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2)^{1/2}$ .

Let  $(\mathcal{F}_t^N)$  be the filtration generated by  $(W_t^N)$  and define  $\langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N} := \langle W^{N,k} \rangle_{t_i^N}$ . Since  $(W_t^N)$  has independent increments, one has  $\langle W^N \rangle_t = \langle W^{N,k} \rangle_t = \mathbb{E}[(W_t^{N,k})^2]$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\langle W^N \rangle_t - t| &= \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (W_t^{N,k})^2 - (W_t^k)^2 \right] \right| \\ &= \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (W_t^{N,k} - W_t^k)^2 - 2(W_t^k - W_t^{N,k})W_t^k \right] \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (W_t^{N,k} - W_t^k)^2 \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |(W_t^k - W_t^{N,k})W_t^k| \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (W_t^{N,k} - W_t^k)^2 \right] + 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (W_t^k - W_t^{N,k})^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (W_t^k)^2 \right]} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

for  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . In particular,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_i |\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N}| = 0.$$

Our standard example for the approximating processes  $(W_t^N)$  will be  $d$ -dimensional Bernoulli random walks:

**Example 2.1** Let

$$t_i^N = i \frac{T}{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{W}_{t_i^N}^{N,k} = \sqrt{\frac{T}{N}} \sum_{j=1}^i X_j^{N,k}$$

for i.i.d random variables  $X_j^{N,k}$  on a probability space  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$  with distribution  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}[X_j^{N,k} = \pm 1] = 1/2$ . Extend  $(\tilde{W}_t^N)$  to  $[0, T]$  such that it is constant on the intervals  $[t_i^N, t_{i+1}^N)$ . Then conditions (A1) and (A2) hold. To fulfill (A3) we must transfer the random walks to another probability space. Since they converge to  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion in distribution, there exists a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$

with a  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion  $(W_t)$  and random walks  $(W_t^N)$  having the same distributions as  $(\tilde{W}_t^N)$  such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |W_t^N - W_t| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{almost surely as } N \rightarrow \infty;$$

see for instance, Theorem I.2.7 in Ikeda and Watanabe (1989). Note that  $\langle W^{N,k} \rangle_T = [W^{N,k}]_T = T$ . Hence, it follows from the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality that for fixed  $p > 2$ , there exists a constant  $C_p$  such that

$$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |W_t^N|^p \right] \leq \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} C_p \sum_{k=1}^d \langle W^{N,k} \rangle_T^{p/2} = C_p d T^{p/2} < \infty,$$

and therefore,

$$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |W_t^N - W_t|^p \right] \leq 2^p \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |W_t^N|^p \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |W_t|^p \right] \right) < \infty.$$

Now it follows from the lemma of de la Vallée-Poussin that the sequence  $(W_t^N)$  satisfies assumption (A3).

The *driver* of the BSDE is a  $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable function

$$f : [0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

where  $\mathcal{P}$  denotes the predictable  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $[0, T] \times \Omega$  with respect to  $(\mathcal{F}_t)$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  are the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebras on  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , respectively. We will assume throughout the paper that for fixed  $(t, \omega)$ ,  $f(t, \omega, y, z)$  is continuous in  $(y, z)$ . In this case,  $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurability of  $f$  is equivalent to  $(t, \omega) \mapsto f(t, \omega, y, z)$  being predictable for all  $(y, z)$ .

The approximating BSDEs are driven by functions

$$f^N : [0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

that are continuous in  $(y, z)$ , constant on the intervals  $(t_i^N, t_{i+1}^N]$  and such that  $\omega \mapsto f^N(t_{i+1}^N, \omega, y, z)$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N$ -measurable. As usual, we henceforth suppress the dependence of  $f$  and  $f^N$  on  $\omega$ .

The *terminal conditions* for the BSDE and BSDEs are given by an  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable random variable  $\xi$  and  $\mathcal{F}_T^N$ -measurable random variables  $\xi^N$ , respectively.

A *solution* of the BSDE consists of a pair of predictable processes  $(Y_t, Z_t)$  with values in  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} Y_t^2 \right] < \infty, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \right] < \infty$$

and

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dW_s. \quad (2.2)$$

In contrast to  $(W_t)$ , the approximating processes  $(W_t^N)$  do in general not have the predictable representation property. Therefore, a *solution* of the  $N$ -th BSDE is a triple of  $(\mathcal{F}_t^N)$ -adapted processes  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$  such that  $(Y_t^N)$  is constant on the intervals  $[t_i^N, t_{i+1}^N)$ ,  $(Z_t^N)$

is constant on the intervals  $(t_i^N, t_{i+1}^N]$ ,  $(M_t^N)$  is a martingale starting at 0 and orthogonal to  $(W_t^N)$  that is constant on the intervals  $[t_i^N, t_{i+1}^N)$  and

$$Y_t^N = \xi^N + \int_{(t,T]} f^N(s, Y_{s-}^N, Z_s^N) d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_{(t,T]} Z_s^N dW_s^N - (M_T^N - M_t^N). \quad (2.3)$$

Due to the particular form of  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$ , (2.3) is equivalent to

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N = Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N + f^N(t_{i+1}^N, Y_{t_i^N}^N, Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} - Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^N - \Delta M_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \quad (2.4)$$

$$Y_T^N = \xi^N. \quad (2.5)$$

Note that if  $(W_t^N)$  is a one-dimensional Bernoulli random walk, it has the predictable representation property and the orthogonal martingale terms in (2.3) and (2.4) disappear.

It is by now well known that if the driver  $f$  is Lipschitz-continuous in  $(y, z)$  and the terminal condition  $\xi$  is in  $L^2$ , the BSDE (2.2) admits a unique solution  $(Y_t, Z_t)$ ; see for instance, Pardoux and Peng (1990) or the survey paper by El Karoui et al. (1997). On the approximation of BSDEs with Lipschitz drivers we recall the following result from Briand et al. (2002). Their assumptions are slightly different. But the result also holds in our setup.

**Theorem 2.2** (Briand et al., 2002)

Assume  $\xi^N \rightarrow \xi$  in  $L^2$  and there exists a constant  $K \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $y, y' \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $z, z' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_t f(t, 0, 0)^2 \right] &< \infty \\ |f(t, y, z) - f(t, y', z')| &\leq K(|y - y'| + |z - z'|), \\ |f^N(t, y, z) - f^N(t, y', z')| &\leq K(|y - y'| + |z - z'|) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sup_t |f^N(t, y, z) - f(t, y, z)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then, for  $N$  large enough, the  $N$ -th BSDE has a unique solution  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$ , and

$$\sup_t \left( |Y_t^N - Y_t| + \left| \int_0^t Z_s^N dW_s^N - \int_0^t Z_s dW_s \right| + |M_t^N| \right) \xrightarrow{(N \rightarrow \infty)} 0 \quad \text{in } L^2$$

as well as

$$\sup_t \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \left| \int_0^t Z_s^{N,k} d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t Z_s^k ds \right|^2 + \left| \int_0^t |Z_s^N|^2 d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t |Z_s|^2 ds \right| \right) \xrightarrow{(N \rightarrow \infty)} 0 \quad \text{in } L^1.$$

**Remark 2.3** Two special cases of terminal conditions satisfying  $\xi^N \rightarrow \xi$  in  $L^2$  are:

- a)  $\xi = \varphi(W_T)$  and  $\xi^N = \varphi(W_T^N)$  for a continuous function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\varphi^2(W_T^N)$ ,  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , is uniformly integrable.
- b)  $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$  general and  $\xi^N = \mathbb{E}[\xi | \mathcal{F}_T^N]$ .

The aim of this paper is to obtain similar convergence results for non-Lipschitz drivers. The following example shows that we cannot hope for general results under the sole assumption  $\xi^N \rightarrow \xi$  in  $L^2$ .

**Example 2.4** Consider a one-dimensional Bernoulli random walk with  $T = 1$ ,  $t_i^N = i/N$  and  $\mathbb{P}[\Delta W_{t_i^N}^N = \pm \sqrt{1/N}] = 1/2$ . Then

$$\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N} = \mathbb{E} \left[ (\Delta W_{t_i^N}^N)^2 \right] = 1/N.$$

Fix  $q \in (1, 2)$  and a sequence of constants  $a^N \geq 2N^{\frac{1-q/2}{q-1}}$ . Consider the BSDEs

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{t_i^N}^N &= Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N + |Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N|^q \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} - Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \\ Y_T^N &= a^N 1_{\{W_{t_N}^N = \sqrt{N}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.1 below

$$Z_{t_N}^N = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{2} a^N 1_{\left\{W_{t_{N-1}^N}^N = \frac{N-1}{\sqrt{N}}\right\}} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{t_{N-1}^N}^N = a_{t_{N-1}^N}^N 1_{\left\{W_{t_{N-1}^N}^N = \frac{N-1}{\sqrt{N}}\right\}}$$

for

$$a_{t_{N-1}^N}^N = \frac{a^N}{2} + 2^{-q} N^{q/2-1} (a^N)^q \geq a^N.$$

Continuing this way one gets

$$Z_{t_{N-1}^N}^N = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{2} a_{t_{N-1}^N}^N 1_{\left\{W_{t_{N-2}^N}^N = \frac{N-2}{\sqrt{N}}\right\}} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{t_{N-2}^N}^N = a_{t_{N-2}^N}^N 1_{\left\{W_{t_{N-2}^N}^N = \frac{N-2}{\sqrt{N}}\right\}}$$

with

$$a_{t_{N-2}^N}^N = \frac{a_{t_{N-1}^N}^N}{2} + 2^{-q} N^{q/2-1} \left( a_{t_{N-1}^N}^N \right)^q \geq a_{t_{N-1}^N}^N,$$

and so on. In particular,

$$Y_0^N \geq a^N \geq 2N^{\frac{1-(q/2)}{q-1}} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{for } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Note that for  $a^N = 2N^{\frac{1-q/2}{q-1}}$ , one has  $\xi^N \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^p$  for all  $p \in (0, \infty)$  but not in  $L^\infty$ .

The example shows that in the case of non-linear growth of  $f^N$  in  $z$  we cannot expect convergence of the discrete-time solutions if the terminal conditions are  $L^p$ -bounded and converge in  $L^p$  for  $p < \infty$ . This is not unexpected since in the literature on BSDEs with non-Lipschitz drivers it is usually required that the terminal condition be in  $L^\infty$  or sufficiently well exponentially integrable (see Kobylanski, 2000, or Briand and Hu, 2006). Even though the approximating BSDEs can have solutions for terminal conditions in  $L^p$  for  $p < \infty$ , they do in general not converge for  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Consequently, in this paper we will always assume:

$$(A4) \quad \sup_N \|\xi^N\|_\infty < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \|\xi\|_\infty < \infty.$$

### 3 Solutions of BSΔEs

**Lemma 3.1** *If a solution  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$  of the  $N$ -th BSΔE exists, one has*

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N - f^N(t_{i+1}^N, Y_{t_i^N}^N, Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} = \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right], \quad (3.1)$$

*and  $(Z_t^N), (M_t^N)$  are uniquely determined by  $(Y_t^N)$  through*

$$Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k} = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k} | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right]}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}} \quad (3.2)$$

$$\Delta M_{t_{i+1}^N}^N = Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N - \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] - Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^N. \quad (3.3)$$

*Proof.* If  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$  is a solution of the  $N$ -th BSΔE, then

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N - f^N(t_{i+1}^N, Y_{t_i^N}^N, Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} + Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^N + \Delta M_{t_{i+1}^N}^N = Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N. \quad (3.4)$$

Taking conditional expectations on both sides with respect to  $\mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N$  gives (3.1). Multiplying both sides of (3.4) with  $\Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k}$  and taking conditional expectations with respect to  $\mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N$  yields (3.2). Finally, (3.3) is a consequence of (3.1) and (3.4).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2** *Assume the  $N$ -th driver and terminal condition are of the special form*

$$f^N(t, y, z) = K(1 + |y| + g(z)) \quad \text{and} \quad \xi^N = C,$$

*for constants  $C, K \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and a measurable function  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $g(0) = 0$ . Then for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\max_i \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N} < 1/K$ , the  $N$ -th BSΔE has a unique solution, given by*

$$Y_T^N = C, \quad Y_{t_i^N}^N = \frac{Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N + K \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}}{1 - K \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}}, \quad Z_{t_i^N}^N = 0, \quad M_{t_i^N}^N = 0. \quad (3.5)$$

*In particular,  $(Y_t^N)$  is deterministic and for  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , converges uniformly to the function  $(C + 1) \exp(K(T - t)) - 1$ .*

*Proof.* Since the terminal condition and the increments  $\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N}$  are deterministic,  $(Z_t^N)$  and  $(M_t^N)$  are both zero and  $(Y_t^N)$  solves

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N = Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N + K(1 + |Y_{t_i^N}^N|) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}, \quad Y_T^N = C. \quad (3.6)$$

This shows (3.5). Moreover, since (3.6) is a deterministic difference equation with Lipschitz coefficient, it follows from Theorem 2.2 that its solutions converges uniformly to the solution of the ordinary differential equation

$$y'(t) = -K(1 + |y(t)|), \quad y(T) = C,$$

given by

$$y(t) = (C + 1) \exp(K(T - t)) - 1.$$

$\square$

Concerning the existence of solutions to BSΔEs, one has the following result. For the special case where  $(W_t^N)$  is a one-dimensional Bernoulli random walk, see Peng (2004).

**Proposition 3.3** Assume there exists a constant  $K \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and a locally bounded function  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that

$$|f^N(t, y, z)| \leq K(1 + |y| + g(z)) \quad \text{and} \quad \max_i \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N} < 1/K.$$

Then the  $N$ -th BS $\Delta E$  has a solution  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$  such that  $(Y_t^N)$  and  $(Z_t^N)$  are bounded. If  $(W_t^N)$  is bounded, then so is  $(M_t^N)$ .

*Proof.* We show the proposition by backwards induction. Set  $Y_T^N = \xi^N$ , which by assumption (A4) is bounded. Now assume that there exists  $i$  and  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$  solving the BS $\Delta E$  (2.3) for  $t \in [t_{i+1}^N, T]$  such that  $(Y_t^N)$  and  $(Z_t^N)$  are bounded. By Lemma 3.1, one must have

$$Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k} = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k} | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right]}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}}.$$

Since by induction hypothesis,  $Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N$  is bounded,  $Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k}$  is well-defined and bounded. Next, we have to find  $Y_{t_i^N}^N \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N)$  such that

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N - f^N(t_{i+1}^N, Y_{t_i^N}^N, Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} = \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right]. \quad (3.7)$$

The mapping  $A(\omega, y) = y - f^N(t_{i+1}^N, y, Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable in  $(\omega, y)$  and continuous in  $y$ . Moreover, one has

$$y - \kappa(1 + |y| + g(Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N)) \leq A(\omega, y) \leq y + \kappa(1 + |y| + g(Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N)) \quad (3.8)$$

for  $\kappa = K \max_i \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N} < 1$ . So it follows from Lemma 3.4 below that there exists an  $\mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable function  $B : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $A(\omega, B(\omega, y)) = y$  for all  $(\omega, y) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ . Thus,

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N = B \left( \omega, \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \right) \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N)$$

solves (3.7), and since  $Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N$  and  $Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N$  are bounded, it follows from the estimate (3.8) that the same is true for  $Y_{t_i^N}^N$ . Finally,  $M_0^N = 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta M_{t_{i+1}^N}^N &= \Delta Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N + f^N(t_{i+1}^N, Y_{t_i^N}^N, Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} - Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \\ &= Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N - \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] - Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \end{aligned}$$

defines a martingale  $(M_t^N)$  orthogonal to  $(W_t^N)$  which is bounded if  $(W_t^N)$  is so. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $A : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  an  $\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable function that is continuous in  $y$  and has the property that for every  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the set  $\{y \in \mathbb{R} : A(\omega, y) \in C\}$  is non-empty and bounded for each non-empty bounded subset  $C$  of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then there exists an  $\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable function  $B : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $A(\omega, B(\omega, x)) = x$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .



*Proof.* For all  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$b_{kl}(\omega) = \inf \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R} : A(\omega, y) \in ((k-1)2^{-l}, k2^{-l}] \right\}$$

is an  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable mapping from  $\Omega$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  and

$$B_l(\omega, x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} b_{kl}(\omega) 1_{\{(k-1)2^{-l} < x \leq k2^{-l}\}}$$

an  $\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable map from  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that

$$B_l(\omega, x) \rightarrow B(\omega, x) \quad \text{as } l \rightarrow \infty,$$

for a  $\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable function  $B : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Since  $y \mapsto A(\omega, y)$  is continuous for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , one obtains

$$A(\omega, B(\omega, x)) = A(\omega, \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} B_l(\omega, x)) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} A(\omega, B_l(\omega, x)) = x$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . □

**Remark 3.5** For  $\max_i \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N} \geq 1/K$  a solution of the  $N$ -th BSΔE might not exist. For example, let  $(W_t^1)$  be a one-dimensional Bernoulli random walk with  $t_0^1 = 0$ ,  $t_1^1 = 1 = T$ ,  $\mathbb{P}[\Delta W_1^1 = \pm 1] = 1/2$ ,  $\xi^1 = 1$  and  $f^1(t, y, z) = y$ . Since the terminal condition is deterministic, one must choose  $Z_1^1 = 0$ , and (3.7) becomes

$$Y_0^1 - Y_0^1 = 1,$$

an equation without solution.

## 4 Comparison principle for BSΔEs

Our main tool to derive convergence results will be a comparison principle for BSΔEs of the following form: Let  $f_1^N, f_2^N$  be drivers and  $\xi_1^N, \xi_2^N$  terminal conditions such that  $f_1^N(t, y, z) \geq f_2^N(t, y, z)$  for all  $t, y, z$  and  $\xi_1^N \geq \xi_2^N$ . Then the corresponding solutions satisfy  $Y_{1,t}^N \geq Y_{2,t}^N$  for all  $t$ .

The next example shows that if the drivers grow quadratically in  $z$ , a general comparison principle for BSΔEs cannot hold.

**Example 4.1** As in Example 2.4, let  $(W_t^N)$  be a one-dimensional Bernoulli random walk with  $T = 1$ ,  $t_i^N = i/N$  and  $\mathbb{P}[\Delta W_{t_i^N}^N = \pm \sqrt{1/N}] = 1/2$ . Consider the BSΔEs

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N = Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N + (Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N)^2 \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} - Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \quad (4.1)$$

$$Y_T^N = a 1_{\left\{ W_{t_N^N}^N = \sqrt{N} \right\}} \quad (4.2)$$

for a constant  $a > 2$  and define  $\varepsilon > 0$  by  $a = 2(1 + 2\varepsilon)$ . Then

$$Z_{t_N^N}^N = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{2} a 1_{\left\{ W_{t_{N-1}^N}^N = \frac{N-1}{\sqrt{N}} \right\}}, \quad Y_{t_{N-1}^N}^N = a_{t_{N-1}^N}^N 1_{\left\{ W_{t_{N-1}^N}^N = \frac{N-1}{\sqrt{N}} \right\}}$$

where

$$a_{t_{N-1}}^N = \frac{a}{2} + \left(\frac{a}{2}\right)^2 = a(1 + \varepsilon),$$

and

$$Z_{t_{N-1}}^N = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{2} a_{t_{N-1}}^N 1_{\left\{W_{t_{N-2}}^N = \frac{N-2}{\sqrt{N}}\right\}}, \quad Y_{t_{N-2}}^N = a_{t_{N-2}}^N 1_{\left\{W_{t_{N-2}}^N = \frac{N-2}{\sqrt{N}}\right\}}$$

for

$$a_{t_{N-2}}^N = \frac{a_{t_{N-1}}^N}{2} + \left(\frac{a_{t_{N-1}}^N}{2}\right)^2 \geq \frac{a_{t_{N-1}}^N}{2} \left(1 + \frac{a}{2}\right) = a_{t_{N-1}}^N (1 + \varepsilon).$$

Continuing this computation one obtains

$$Y_0^N \geq a(1 + \varepsilon)^N \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Note that the terminal conditions  $Y_T^N$  are uniformly  $L^\infty$ -bounded in  $N$  and  $Y_T^N \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^p$  for all  $p < \infty$ . But the solutions  $Y_t^N$  explode as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . We point out that for fixed  $N$ , the solutions to equation (4.1) are not monotone in the terminal condition. Indeed,  $(\tilde{Y}_t^N, \tilde{Z}_t^N) \equiv (a, 0)$  is a solution of equation (4.1) with terminal condition  $\tilde{Y}_T^N = a \geq Y_T^N$ . However,  $\tilde{Y}_0^N < Y_0^N$ . In particular, the comparison principle is violated.

In view of Example 4.1 we restrict ourselves in the following theorem to drivers that grow less than quadratically in  $z$ . We also need the following assumption on the increments of  $(W_t^N)$  for a constant  $q \in [1, 2)$ :

$$(W1) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i, k} \frac{\|\Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N, k}\|_\infty}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N}^{q/4}} = 0.$$

**Theorem 4.2** *Let  $C, K, L \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and assume that (W1) holds for some  $q \in [1, 2)$ . Then there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for every  $N \geq N_0$ , all drivers  $f_1^N \geq f_2^N$  and terminal conditions  $\xi_1^N \geq \xi_2^N$  satisfying*

- (i)  $\|\xi_m^N\|_\infty \leq C$
- (ii)  $|f_m^N(t, y, z)| \leq K(1 + |y| + |z|^q)$  for all  $(t, y, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$
- (iii)  $|f_m^N(t, y_1, z) - f_m^N(t, y_2, z)| \leq L(1 + |z|^q)|y_1 - y_2|$   
for all  $(t, y_1, y_2, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{d+2}$  such that  $|y_1|, |y_2| \leq (C + 1) \exp(KT)$
- (iv)  $|f_m^N(t, y, z_1) - f_m^N(t, y, z_2)| \leq L(1 + (|z_1| \vee |z_2|)^{q/2})|z_1 - z_2|$   
for all  $(t, y, z_1, z_2) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$  such that  $|y| \leq (C + 1) \exp(KT)$ ,

the BSDEs with parameters  $(f_m^N, \xi_m^N)$  have unique solutions  $(Y_m^N, Z_m^N, M_m^N)$ ,  $m = 1, 2$ , and

$$(C + 1) \exp\{K(T - t)\} \geq Y_{1,t}^N \geq Y_{2,t}^N \geq -(C + 1) \exp\{K(T - t)\} \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T].$$

To prove Theorem 4.2 we need the following two lemmas:

**Lemma 4.3** *Let  $C, K \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and assume that (W1) holds for some  $q \in [1, 2]$ . Then there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for every  $N \geq N_0$ , all drivers  $f_1^N \geq f_2^N$  and terminal conditions  $\xi_1^N \geq \xi_2^N$  satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.2 as well as*

$$(iii) \quad |f_m^N(t, y_1, z) - f_m^N(t, y_2, z)| \leq K(1 + |z|^q)|y_1 - y_2| \text{ for all } (t, y_1, y_2, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{d+2}$$

$$(iv) \quad |f_m^N(t, y, z_1) - f_m^N(t, y, z_2)| \leq qK(1 + (|z_1| \vee |z_2|)^{q/2})|z_1 - z_2| \text{ for all } (t, y, z_1, z_2) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d+1},$$

*the BSDEs with parameters  $(f_m^N, \xi_m^N)$  have unique solutions  $(Y_{m,t}^N, Z_{m,t}^N, M_{m,t}^N)$ ,  $m = 1, 2$ , and*

$$(C + 1) \exp(K(T - t)) \geq Y_{1,t}^N \geq Y_{2,t}^N \geq -(C + 1) \exp(K(T - t)) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (4.3)$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.2, there exists  $N_1 \geq 1$  such that for all  $N \geq N_1$ ,

$$\max_i \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N} < 1/K$$

and the BSDE with driver  $\hat{f}^N(t, y, z) = K(1 + |y| + |z|^q)$  and terminal condition  $\hat{\xi}^N = C$  has a deterministic solution  $(\hat{Y}_t^N)$  that is bounded by  $(C + 1) \exp(K(T - t))$ . Set  $D = 2(C + 1) \exp(KT)$ . Since  $q < 2$  and (W1) holds, there exists  $N_0 \geq N_1$  such that

$$\sup_{N \geq N_0} \max_i K \left( 1 + d^{q/2} D^q \left[ \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N} \right]^{-q/2} \right) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N} < 1 \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$\sup_{N \geq N_0} \max_{i,k} dqK \left( 1 + d^{q/4} D^{q/2} \left[ \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N} \right]^{-q/4} \right) \left\| \Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N,k} \right\|_\infty \leq 1. \quad (4.5)$$

Fix  $N \geq N_0$  and let  $f_1^N \geq f_2^N$  be drivers and  $\xi_1^N \geq \xi_2^N$  terminal conditions satisfying (i)–(iv). By Proposition 3.3, both BSDEs have a solution  $(Y_{m,t}^N, Z_{m,t}^N, M_{m,t}^N)$ ,  $m = 1, 2$ , and (4.3) clearly holds at the final time  $T$ . We now go backwards in time and assume (4.3) is true on  $[t_{i+1}, T]$ . Then

$$(C + 1) \exp(K(T - t_{i+1}^N)) \geq Y_{1,t_{i+1}^N}^N \geq Y_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N \geq -(C + 1) \exp(K(T - t_{i+1}^N)). \quad (4.6)$$

By Lemma 3.1, one has

$$Z_{m,t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k} = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{m,t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k} | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right]}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}}, \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$Y_{m,t_i^N}^N = \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{m,t_{i+1}^N}^N | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] + f_m^N(t_{i+1}^N, Y_{m,t_i^N}^N, Z_{m,t_{i+1}^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}.$$

Set

$$Y_t^N := Y_{1,t}^N - Y_{2,t}^N, \quad Z_t^N := Z_{1,t}^N - Z_{2,t}^N.$$

By (4.6),  $Y_{1,t_{i+1}^N}^N$ ,  $Y_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N$  and  $Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N$  are bounded by  $D$  and

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N = \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \right] + (\alpha + Y_{t_i^N}^N \beta + Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \gamma) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}$$

for

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &= f_1^N(t_{i+1}^N, Y_{2,t_i^N}^N, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N) - f_2^N(t_{i+1}^N, Y_{2,t_i^N}^N, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N) \\
\beta &= \frac{1}{Y_{t_i^N}^N} \left( f_1^N(t_{i+1}^N, Y_{1,t_i^N}^N, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N) - f_1^N(t_{i+1}^N, Y_{2,t_i^N}^N, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N) \right) \\
\gamma^k &= \frac{1}{Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k}} \left( f_1^N(t_{i+1}^N, Y_{1,t_i^N}^N, Z_{1,t_{i+1}^N}^{N,1}, \dots, Z_{1,t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k}, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k+1}, \dots, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^{N,d}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - f_1^N(t_{i+1}^N, Y_{1,t_i^N}^N, Z_{1,t_{i+1}^N}^{N,1}, \dots, Z_{1,t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k-1}, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k}, \dots, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^{N,d}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

It can be seen from (4.7) that for  $m = 1, 2$ ,

$$\left| Z_{m,t_{i+1}^N}^N \right|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^d \left( Z_{m,t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k} \right)^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^d \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ (Y_{m,t_{i+1}^N}^N)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ (\Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k})^2 \right]}{(\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}^N)^2} \leq \frac{dD^2}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}^N}. \quad (4.8)$$

So by assumption (iii) and (4.4),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \beta \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} \right| &\leq K(1 + |Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N|^q) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} \\
&\leq K \left( 1 + d^{q/2} D^q [\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}^N]^{-q/2} \right) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} < 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] + (\alpha + Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \gamma) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}^N}{1 - \beta \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}^N}. \quad (4.9)$$

From assumption (iv) and (4.8) one obtains

$$|\gamma| \leq d^{1/2} q K \left( 1 + \left( \left| Z_{1,t_{i+1}^N}^N \right| \vee \left| Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N \right| \right)^{q/2} \right) \leq d^{1/2} q K \left( 1 + d^{q/4} D^{q/2} (\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}^N)^{-q/4} \right)$$

and from (4.7),

$$\left| Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \right| \leq d^{1/2} \max_k \frac{\left\| \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k} \right\|_\infty}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}^N} \mathbb{E} \left[ |Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N| \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right].$$

By (4.5), this yields

$$\begin{aligned}
|Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \gamma| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} &\leq |Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N| |\gamma| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} \\
&\leq dq K \left( 1 + d^{q/4} D^{q/2} (\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}^N)^{-q/4} \right) \max_k \left\| \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k} \right\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left[ |Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N| \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ |Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N| \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \geq 0$  and  $\alpha \geq 0$ , it follows from (4.9) that  $Y_{1,t_i^N}^N - Y_{2,t_i^N}^N = Y_{t_i^N}^N \geq 0$ . Now observe that  $\hat{f}^N$  satisfies assumptions (ii)–(iv). So the same argument applied to the equations corresponding to  $(\hat{f}^N, C)$  and  $(f_1^N, \xi^N)$  gives

$$(C + 1) \exp(K(T - t_i^N)) \geq \hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \geq Y_{1,t_i^N}^N.$$

Analogously, one deduces

$$Y_{2,t_i^N}^N \geq (C+1) \exp(K(T-t_i^N)),$$

and the induction step is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4** *Let  $C, K \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and assume (W1) holds for some  $q \in [1, 2)$ . Then there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for every  $N \geq N_0$ , all drivers  $f^N$  and terminal conditions  $\xi^N$  satisfying*

$$(i) \quad \|\xi^N\|_\infty \leq C$$

$$(ii) \quad |f^N(t, y, z)| \leq K(1 + |y| + |z|^q) \text{ for all } t \in [0, T], y \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } z \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

*the  $N$ -th BS $\Delta$ E has a solution  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$  such that*

$$|Y_t^N| \leq (C+1) \exp(K(T-t)) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (4.10)$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.2, there exists  $N_1 \geq 1$  such that for all  $N \geq N_1$ ,

$$\max_i \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N} < 1/K \quad (4.11)$$

and the BS $\Delta$ E with driver  $\hat{f}^N(t, y, z) = K(1 + |y| + |z|^q)$  and terminal condition  $\hat{\xi}^N = C$  has a deterministic solution  $(\hat{Y}_t^N)$  that is bounded by  $(C+1) \exp(K(T-t))$ . Choose  $N_0 \geq N_1$  such that for all  $N \geq N_0$ , the statement of Lemma 4.3 holds for all terminal conditions bounded by  $(C+1) \exp(KT)$  and drivers satisfying conditions (ii)–(iv) of Lemma 4.3. Now fix  $N \geq N_0$  and note that by Proposition 3.3 the  $N$ -th BS $\Delta$ E has a solution  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$ . Since  $\hat{Y}_t^N$  is bounded by  $(C+1) \exp(K(T-t))$ , it is enough to show that

$$\hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \geq Y_{t_i^N}^N \geq -\hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \quad \text{for all } i. \quad (4.12)$$

By condition (i), (4.12) holds for  $t = T$ . For  $t < T$  we argue by backwards induction. So let us assume that (4.12) holds for  $t = t_{i+1}^N$ . We will only show  $\hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \geq Y_{t_i^N}^N$ . The second inequality in (4.12) follows analogously. From Lemma 3.1 we know that

$$Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k} = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^{N,k} | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right]}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}}$$

and

$$A(\omega, Y_{t_i^N}^N) = \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right],$$

where  $A(\omega, y) = y - f(t_{i+1}^N, y, Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}$ . Consider the BS $\Delta$ E with driver

$$\tilde{f}^N(t_j^N, y, z) = \begin{cases} K(1 + |y| + |z|^q) & \text{for } j = i+1 \\ 0 & \text{for } j \neq i+1 \end{cases}$$

and terminal condition  $Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N$ . By Lemma 4.3, it has a unique solution  $(\tilde{Y}_t^N)$ , and it is easy to see that  $\tilde{Y}_{t_{i+1}^N}^N = Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N$ . Due to (4.11), the mapping  $\tilde{A}(\omega, y) = y - \tilde{f}(t_{i+1}^N, y, Z_{t_{i+1}^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}$  is strictly increasing in  $y$  and since  $\tilde{f}^N(t_{i+1}^N, \cdot, \cdot) \geq f^N(t_{i+1}^N, \cdot, \cdot)$ , one has

$$\tilde{A}(\omega, \tilde{Y}_{t_i^N}^N) = \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i+1}^N}^N | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] = A(\omega, Y_{t_i^N}^N) \geq \tilde{A}(\omega, Y_{t_i^N}^N).$$

This shows  $\tilde{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \geq Y_{t_i^N}^N$ . To conclude the proof, consider the solution  $(\bar{Y}_t^N)$  of the BSDE with driver  $\tilde{f}^N$  and terminal condition  $\hat{Y}_{t_{i+1}^N}^N$ . Then  $\bar{Y}_{t_i^N}^N = \hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N$  and Lemma 4.3 yields  $\bar{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \geq \tilde{Y}_{t_i^N}^N$ . Consequently,

$$\hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N = \bar{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \geq \tilde{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \geq Y_{t_i^N}^N,$$

which completes the induction step.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 4.2.** By Lemma 4.4, there exists an  $N_1$  such that for all  $N \geq N_1$ ,  $|Y_t^N| \leq (C+1)\exp(KT)$  for every solution corresponding to a driver and terminal condition satisfying (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.2. Now choose  $N_0 \geq N_1$  such that Lemma 4.3 holds for  $\tilde{K} = K \vee L$  instead of  $K$  and fix  $N \geq N_0$ . If  $f_1^N \geq f_2^N$  and  $\xi_1^N \geq \xi_2^N$  are drivers and terminal conditions satisfying conditions (i)–(iv) of Theorem 4.2, then  $|Y_{m,t}^N| \leq (C+1)\exp(KT)$  for  $m = 1, 2$ . So we can change the drivers  $f_m^N$  for  $|y| > (C+1)\exp(KT)$  such that they satisfy the conditions of Lemma 4.3, and the theorem follows.  $\square$

## 5 Convergence results for drivers with subquadratic growth

With a slight abuse of notation, the drivers can be written as  $f^N(t, W^N, y, z)$ . By predictability,  $f^N(t_{i+1}^N, W^N, y, z)$  only depends on  $W_{t_1^N}^N, \dots, W_{t_i^N}^N$ . We fix  $q \in [1, 2)$  and introduce the following conditions on the drivers  $f^N$ : There exists a constant  $K > 0$  such that

(f1) For all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $w \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times i_N}$  and  $(t, y, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ ,

$$|f^N(t, w, y, z)| \leq K(1 + |y| + |z|^q).$$

(f2) For all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $w \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times i_N}$  and  $(t, y_1, y_2, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{d+2}$ ,

$$|f^N(t, w, y_1, z) - f^N(t, w, y_2, z)| \leq K|y_1 - y_2|.$$

(f3) For every  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$  there exists  $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $y \in [-a, a]$ ,  $w \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times i_N}$  and  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|f^N(t, w, y, z_1) - f^N(t, w, y, z_2)| \leq b(1 + (|z_1| \vee |z_2|)^{q/2})|z_1 - z_2|.$$

(f4) For all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, i_N - 1$ ,  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times i_N}$  and  $(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ ,

$$|f^N(t_{i+1}^N, w_1, y, z) - f^N(t_{i+1}^N, w_2, y, z)| \leq K \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_i^N} |w_1(t) - w_2(t)|.$$

(f5) For all  $(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ ,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |f^N(t, y, z) - f(t, y, z)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^2 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

For a measurable function  $g : [0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , denote

$$\|g\|_\infty = \text{ess sup}_\omega \sup_{t, y, z} |g(t, \omega, y, z)|.$$

**Lemma 5.1** *Let  $C, K \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and assume (W1) holds for some  $q \in [1, 2)$ . Then there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and a constant  $D \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $N \geq N_0$ , all terminal conditions  $\xi_1^N, \xi_2^N$  bounded by  $C$  and drivers  $f_1^N, f_2^N$  satisfying (f1)–(f3) as well as  $\|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty \leq K$ , the BSΔEs with parameters  $(f_m^N, \xi_m^N)$  have unique solutions  $(Y_{m,t}^N, Z_{m,t}^N, M_{m,t}^N)$ ,  $m = 1, 2$ , and*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_{1,t}^N - Y_{2,t}^N| \leq D(\|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty + \|\xi_1^N - \xi_2^N\|_\infty).$$

*Proof.* Set  $\tilde{C} = 3C$  and  $\tilde{K} = 2K(2C + K + 1)(\exp(KT) + 1)(T + 1)$ . Choose  $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that condition (f3) holds for  $a = (\tilde{C} + 1)\exp(\tilde{K}T)$ . It follows from (2.1) that  $\prod_{i=1}^{i_N} (1 - K\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N}) \rightarrow \exp(-KT)$  for  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . So there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $N \geq N_0$ ,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{i_N} (1 - K\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N})^{-1} \leq \exp(KT) + 1, \quad \langle W^N \rangle_T \leq T + 1,$$

and the statement of Theorem 4.2 holds for  $\tilde{C}$  instead of  $C$ ,  $\tilde{K}$  instead of  $K$  and  $L = K \vee b$ . Set  $D = (\exp(KT) + 1)(T + 1)$  and fix  $N \geq N_0$  as well as terminal conditions  $\xi_1^N, \xi_2^N$  bounded by  $C$  and drivers  $f_1^N, f_2^N$  satisfying (f1)–(f3) together with  $\|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty \leq K$ . Then the parameter pairs  $(f_m^N, \xi_m^N)$ ,  $m = 1, 2$ , and  $(\tilde{f}^N, \tilde{\xi}^N)$ , where  $\tilde{f}^N = f_2^N + \|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty$  and  $\tilde{\xi}^N = \xi_2^N + \|\xi_1^N - \xi_2^N\|_\infty$ , satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4.2 for  $\tilde{C}$  instead of  $C$ ,  $\tilde{K}$  instead of  $K$  and  $L = K \vee b$ . Therefore, the corresponding BSΔEs have unique solutions, which, since  $\tilde{f}^N \geq f_1^N$  and  $\tilde{\xi}^N \geq \xi_1^N$ , satisfy  $\tilde{Y}_t^N \geq Y_{1,t}^N$  for all  $t$ . Note that the solution of the deterministic BSΔE

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N &= \hat{Y}_{t_{i+1}^N}^N + (\|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty + K\hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N)\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} \\ \hat{Y}_T^N &= \|\xi_1^N - \xi_2^N\|_\infty, \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

is given by

$$\hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N = \frac{\|\xi_1^N - \xi_2^N\|_\infty}{\prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 - K\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N})} + \|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} \frac{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N}}{\prod_{l=i+1}^j (1 - K\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_l^N})}.$$

In particular,  $\hat{Y}_t^N$  is positive and decreasing in  $t$  and

$$\hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \leq \frac{\|\xi_1^N - \xi_2^N\|_\infty + \|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N}}{\prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 - K\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N})}.$$

Hence, by our choice of the constant  $D$ , we obtain the estimate

$$\sup_t \hat{Y}_t^N = \hat{Y}_0^N \leq D(\|\xi_1^N - \xi_2^N\|_\infty + \|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty). \tag{5.2}$$

In particular, since  $\|\xi_1^N - \xi_2^N\|_\infty \leq 2C$  and  $\|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty \leq K$ , one obtains from (5.2) that

$$\sup_t \hat{Y}_t^N \leq (2C + K)(\exp(KT) + 1)(T + 1). \tag{5.3}$$

Next, notice that the process

$$\bar{Y}_t^N := Y_{2,t}^N + \hat{Y}_t^N$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{Y}_{t_i^N}^N &= \bar{Y}_{t_{i+1}^N}^N + \left\{ f_2^N(t_{i+1}^N, W^N, Y_{2,t_i^N}^N, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N) + \|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty + K\hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \right\} \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} \\ &\quad - Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^N - \Delta M_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N \\ \bar{Y}_T^N &= \xi_2^N + \|\xi_1^N - \xi_2^N\|_\infty,\end{aligned}$$

and since  $f_2^N$  is  $K$ -Lipschitz in  $y$ , one has

$$f_2^N(t_{i+1}^N, W^N, \bar{Y}_{t_i^N}^N, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N) \leq f_2^N(t_{i+1}^N, W^N, Y_{2,t_i^N}^N, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N) + K\hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N.$$

Hence,

$$\alpha_{t_i^N} = f_2^N(t_{i+1}^N, W^N, Y_{2,t_i^N}^N, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N) - f_2^N(t_{i+1}^N, W^N, \bar{Y}_{t_i^N}^N, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N) + K\hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \geq 0$$

and  $\bar{Y}^N$  satisfies the BSΔE

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{Y}_{t_i^N}^N &= \bar{Y}_{t_{i+1}^N}^N + \left\{ f_2^N(t_{i+1}^N, W^N, \bar{Y}_{t_i^N}^N, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N) + \|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty + \alpha_{t_i^N} \right\} \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N} \\ &\quad - Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_{i+1}^N}^N - \Delta M_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N \\ \bar{Y}_T^N &= \xi_2^N + \|\xi_1^N - \xi_2^N\|_\infty.\end{aligned}\tag{5.4}$$

Since  $f_2^N$  is  $K$ -Lipschitz in  $y$ , one obtains from the estimate (5.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\alpha_{t_i^N}\|_\infty &\leq \left\| f_2^N(t_{i+1}^N, W^N, Y_{2,t_i^N}^N, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N) - f_2^N(t_{i+1}^N, W^N, \bar{Y}_{t_i^N}^N, Z_{2,t_{i+1}^N}^N) \right\|_\infty + K \left\| \hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq 2K \left\| \hat{Y}_{t_i^N}^N \right\|_\infty \leq 2K(2C + K)(\exp(KT) + 1)(T + 1),\end{aligned}$$

which shows that the BSΔE (5.4) satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 4.2 for  $\tilde{C}$ ,  $\tilde{K}$  and  $L = K \vee b$ . Hence, a comparison of  $\hat{Y}^N$  to  $\bar{Y}^N$  yields

$$Y_{1,t}^N \leq \hat{Y}_t^N \leq \bar{Y}_t^N = Y_{2,t}^N + \hat{Y}_t^N \leq Y_{2,t}^N + D(\|\xi_1^N - \xi_2^N\|_\infty + \|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty).$$

for all  $t$ . By symmetry, one also has

$$Y_{2,t}^N \leq Y_{1,t}^N + D(\|f_1^N - f_2^N\|_\infty + \|\xi_1^N - \xi_2^N\|_\infty)$$

for all  $t$ , and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.2** Assume (W1) holds for some  $q \in [1, 2)$ , the  $f^N$  fulfill (f1)–(f4) and the  $\xi^N$  are of the form  $\xi^N = \varphi(W_{s_1}^N, \dots, W_{s_n}^N)$  for a fixed  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $0 \leq s_1 < \dots < s_n \leq T$ , and a bounded Lipschitz-continuous function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then there exists an  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\sup_{N \geq N_0} \|\sup_t |Z_t^N|\|_\infty < \infty$ .

*Proof.* Let  $C \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\varphi$  is bounded by  $C$  and  $|\varphi(w_1) - \varphi(w_2)| \leq C \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} |w_1(s_i) - w_2(s_i)|$  for all  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ . Choose  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $D \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $N \geq N_0$ ,  $\sup_i |\Delta W_{t_i^N}^N| \leq 1$  and the statement of Lemma 5.1 holds. From Lemma 3.1 we know that

$$Z_{t_i^N}^{N,k} = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_i^N}^N \Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N,k} | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}^N}^N \right]}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N}},$$



and since  $Y_{t_i^N}^N$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N$ -measurable, it can be written as

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N = y_i^N(W_{t_1^N}^N, \dots, W_{t_i^N}^N)$$

for a Borel measurable function  $y_i^N : \mathbb{R}^{d \times i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We want to show that  $y_i^N$  can be chosen uniformly Lipschitz-continuous in the last argument. To do that let us condition on  $W_{t_j^N}^N = w(t_j^N)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, i-1$  and  $W_{t_i^N}^N = x$ . Denote  $\tilde{W}_t^N = W_t^N - W_{t_i^N}^N$ ,  $t \in [t_i^N, T]$ , and define  $r = \max\{m : s_m \leq t_i^N\}$ . Then for  $t_j^N \geq t_i^N$ , the conditioned BSΔE with solution  $(Y_t^{N,x}, Z_t^{N,x}, M_t^{N,x})$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{t_j^N}^{N,x} &= Y_{t_{j+1}^N}^{N,x} + f^N(t_{j+1}^N, w(t_1^N), \dots, w(t_{i-1}^N), x + \tilde{W}^N, Y_{t_j^N}^{N,x}, Z_{t_{j+1}^N}^{N,x}) \Delta \left\langle \tilde{W}^N \right\rangle_{t_{j+1}^N} \\ &\quad - Z_{t_{j+1}^N}^{N,x} \Delta \tilde{W}_{t_{j+1}^N}^N - \Delta M_{t_{j+1}^N}^{N,x} \\ Y_T^{N,x} &= \varphi(w(s_1), \dots, w(s_r), x + \tilde{W}_{s_{r+1}}^N, \dots, x + \tilde{W}_{s_n}^N). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Thus, for  $t \geq t_i^N$  we have  $Y_t^{N,x} = \bar{Y}_t^{N,x}$ , where  $(\bar{Y}_t^{N,x})$  solves the BSΔE driven by the processes  $(W_t^N)$  with terminal conditions  $\varphi(w(s_1), \dots, w(s_r), x + W_{s_{r+1}}^N - W_{t_i^N}^N, \dots, x + W_{s_n}^N - W_{t_i^N}^N)$ , and drivers

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}^{N,x}(t, w(t_1^N), \dots, w(t_{i-1}^N), W^N, y, z) \\ = \begin{cases} f^N(t, w(t_1^N), \dots, w(t_{i-1}^N), x + W^N - W_{t_i^N}^N, y, z) & \text{for } t > t_i^N \\ 0 & \text{for } t \leq t_i^N. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, all  $\bar{f}^{N,x}$  are adapted, left-continuous and satisfy (f1)–(f3). By our Lipschitz assumptions we have,

$$\|Y_T^{N,x_1} - Y_T^{N,x_2}\|_\infty \leq C|x_1 - x_2|$$

and

$$\|\bar{f}^{N,x_1} - \bar{f}^{N,x_2}\|_\infty \leq K|x_1 - x_2|$$

for all  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . In particular,

$$\|\bar{f}^{N,x_1} - \bar{f}^{N,x_2}\|_\infty \leq K$$

if  $|x_1 - x_2| \leq 1$ . So we obtain from Lemma 5.1 that for all  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $|x_1 - x_2| \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_{t_i^N}^{N,x_1} - Y_{t_i^N}^{N,x_2}| &\leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\bar{Y}_t^{N,x_1} - \bar{Y}_t^{N,x_2}| \\ &\leq D \left( \|\xi^{N,x_1} - \xi^{N,x_2}\|_\infty + \|\bar{f}^{N,x_1} - \bar{f}^{N,x_2}\|_\infty \right) \\ &\leq D(C + K)|x_1 - x_2|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ y_{t_i^N}^N(W_{t_1^N}^N, \dots, W_{t_{i-1}^N}^N, W_{t_i^N}^N) \Delta \left\langle W^N \right\rangle_{t_i^N} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}^N}^N \right] = 0,$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
|Z_{t_i^N}^{N,k}| &= \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N}^{-1} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_i^N}^N \Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N,k} | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}^N}^N \right] \right| \\
&= \frac{\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( y_{t_i^N}^N(W_{t_1^N}^N, \dots, W_{t_{i-1}^N}^N, W_{t_{i-1}^N}^N + \Delta W_{t_i^N}^N) - y_{t_i^N}^N(W_{t_1^N}^N, \dots, W_{t_{i-1}^N}^N, W_{t_{i-1}^N}^N) \right) \Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N,k} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}^N}^N \right] \right|}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N}} \\
&\leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ |y_{t_i^N}^N(W_{t_1^N}^N, \dots, W_{t_{i-1}^N}^N, W_{t_{i-1}^N}^N + \Delta W_{t_i^N}^N) - y_{t_i^N}^N(W_{t_1^N}^N, \dots, W_{t_{i-1}^N}^N, W_{t_{i-1}^N}^N)| |\Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N,k}| \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}^N}^N \right]}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N}} \\
&\leq D(C + K) \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ |\Delta W_{t_i^N}^N| |\Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N,k}| \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}^N}^N \right]}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N}} \\
&\leq D(C + K) \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ |\Delta W_{t_i^N}^N| |\Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N,k}| \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}^N}^N \right]}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N}} = D(C + K)d.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Remark 5.3**  $\sup_{N \geq N_0} \|\sup_t |Z_t^N|\|_\infty < \infty$  might not hold if  $\varphi$  is not Lipschitz-continuous. For example, consider a one-dimensional Bernoulli random walk with  $T = 1$ ,  $t_i^N = i/N$  and  $\mathbb{P}[\Delta W_{t_i^N}^N = \pm \sqrt{1/N}] = 1/2$ . Consider terminal conditions of the form

$$\xi^N = \begin{cases} \sqrt{W_1^N} \wedge 1 & \text{if } W_1^N \geq 0 \\ -\sqrt{-W_1^N} \vee -1 & \text{if } W_1^N < 0. \end{cases}$$

For all  $N \geq 1$ , on the set  $\{W_{(N-1)/N}^N = 0\}$  one has  $\xi^N = \text{sign}(\Delta W_1^N) \sqrt{|\Delta W_1^N|}$ , and hence, by Lemma 3.1,

$$Z_1^N = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \xi^N \Delta W_1^N | W_{(N-1)/N}^N = 0 \right]}{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_1} = N^{1/4}.$$

In particular,  $Z_1^N \rightarrow \infty$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  on the set  $\{W_{(N-1)/N}^N = 0\}$ .

**Lemma 5.4** Assume (W1) holds for some  $q \in [1, 2)$  and  $\xi$  and  $\xi^N$  are of the form  $\xi = \varphi(W_{s_1}, \dots, W_{s_n})$  and  $\xi^N = \varphi(W_{s_1}^N, \dots, W_{s_n}^N)$  for fixed  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $0 \leq s_1 < \dots < s_n \leq T$ , and a bounded Lipschitz-continuous function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, suppose that (f1)–(f5) hold. Then there exists a solution  $(Y_t, Z_t)$  of the continuous BSDE (2.2) satisfying  $\|\sup_t |Z_t|\|_\infty < \infty$  and

$$\sup_t \left( |Y_t^N - Y_t| + \left| \int_0^t Z_s^N dW_s^N - \int_0^t Z_s dW_s \right| + |M_t^N| \right) \xrightarrow{(N \rightarrow \infty)} 0 \quad \text{in } L^2$$

as well as

$$\sup_t \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \left| \int_0^t Z_s^{N,k} d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t Z_s^k ds \right|^2 + \left| \int_0^t |Z_s^N|^2 d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t |Z_s|^2 ds \right| \right) \xrightarrow{(N \rightarrow \infty)} 0 \quad \text{in } L^1.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.2, there exist  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and a constant  $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\sup_{N \geq N_0} \|\sup_t |Z_t^N|\|_\infty \leq R$ . Define

$$\hat{f}^N(t, y, z) = \begin{cases} f^N(t, y, z) & \text{for } |z| \leq R \\ f^N(t, y, Rz/|z|) & \text{for } |z| > R \end{cases}$$

and

$$\hat{f}(t, y, z) = \begin{cases} f(t, y, z) & \text{for } |z| \leq R \\ f(t, y, Rz/|z|) & \text{for } |z| > R. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, the  $\hat{f}^N$  are uniformly Lipschitz in  $(y, z)$  and

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\hat{f}^N(t, y, z) - \hat{f}(t, y, z)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^2 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

It follows that  $\hat{f}^N$  and  $\hat{f}$  fulfill the conditions of Theorem 2.2. Denote by  $(\hat{Y}_t^N, \hat{Z}_t^N, \hat{M}_t^N)$  the solution to the BSDE with parameters  $(\hat{f}^N, \xi^N)$  and by  $(\hat{Y}_t, \hat{Z}_t)$  the solution of the BSDE corresponding to  $(\hat{f}, \xi)$ . Since the  $(Z_t^N)$  are bounded by  $R$ ,  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$  is also a solution of the BSDE corresponding to  $(\hat{f}^N, \xi^N)$ . So it follows from Theorem 4.2 that for  $N$  large enough,  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N) = (\hat{Y}_t^N, \hat{Z}_t^N, \hat{M}_t^N)$ , and we may apply Theorem 2.2 to conclude that

$$\sup_t \left( |Y_t^N - \hat{Y}_t| + \left| \int_0^t Z_s^N dW_s^N - \int_0^t \hat{Z}_s dW_s \right| + |M_t^N| \right) \xrightarrow{(N \rightarrow \infty)} 0 \text{ in } L^2, \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$\sup_t \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \left| \int_0^t Z_s^{N,k} d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t \hat{Z}_s^k ds \right|^2 + \left| \int_0^t |Z_s^N|^2 d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t |\hat{Z}_s|^2 ds \right| \right) \xrightarrow{(N \rightarrow \infty)} 0 \quad (5.7)$$

in  $L^1$ . If we now can show  $\|\sup_t |\hat{Z}_t|\|_\infty \leq R$ , then  $(\hat{Y}, \hat{Z})$  is also a solution of our original BSDE. Therefore, we can set  $(Y, Z) = (\hat{Y}, \hat{Z})$ , and the lemma follows. Passing to a subsequence if necessary one obtains from (5.7) that

$$\sup_t \left| \int_0^t |Z_s^N|^2 d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t |\hat{Z}_s|^2 ds \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ almost surely.} \quad (5.8)$$

This together with (2.1) implies  $\|\sup_t |\hat{Z}_t|\|_\infty \leq R$ , and the proof is complete.  $\square$

Let us recall the following result which follows from Theorems 2.5–2.7 of Morlais (2009):

**Theorem 5.5** (Morlais, 2009)

Let  $K \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that

$$|f(t, y, z)| \leq K(1 + |y| + |z|^2), \quad (5.9)$$

$$|f(t, y_1, z) - f(t, y_2, z)| \leq K|y_1 - y_2| \text{ for all } y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (5.10)$$

and for every  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$  there exists  $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that

$$|f(t, y, z_1) - f(t, y, z_2)| \leq b(1 + (|z_1| \vee |z_2|)^{q/2})|z_1 - z_2| \quad (5.11)$$

for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $y \in [-a, a]$  and  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then the BSDE (2.2) has exactly one solution  $(Y_t, Z_t)$  such that  $(Y_t)$  is bounded. Furthermore, the comparison principle holds, that is, for bounded terminal conditions  $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2$  and drivers  $f_1 \geq f_2$  fulfilling (5.9)–(5.11), the corresponding solutions satisfy  $Y_{1,t} \geq Y_{2,t}$  for all  $t$ .

**Remark 5.6** Similarly to our results for BSDEs, in Morlais (2009) the growth condition (5.9) is needed to prove the existence of a solution  $(Y_t, Z_t)$  such that  $(Y_t)$  is bounded. Conditions (5.10)–(5.11) are needed to ensure comparison results and uniqueness. Actually, Morlais (2009) proves this result under slightly different assumptions. The underlying noise process is continuous but does not have to be a Brownian motion, and condition (5.11) is assumed to hold for a constant  $b$  independent of  $a$ . However, if one has two solutions  $(Y_{m,t}, Z_{m,t})$ ,  $m = 1, 2$ , such that  $(Y_{1,t})$  and  $(Y_{2,t})$  are both bounded by a constant  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , then the driver  $f(t, y, z)$  only matters for  $y \in [-a, a]$ . Hence, our version, (5.11), is sufficient for the comparison principle.

Another useful result, which we will use in the sequel, is the following:

**Proposition 5.7** (Briand and Hu, 2006)

Let  $(\xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable random variables such that  $\sup_m \|\xi_m\|_\infty < \infty$  and  $\xi_m \rightarrow \xi$  almost surely. Furthermore assume that  $f$  satisfies (5.9). Let  $(Y_{m,t}, Z_{m,t})$  and  $(Y_t, Z_t)$  be solutions of the BSDEs corresponding to  $(f, \xi_m)$  and  $(f, \xi)$ , respectively, such that  $(Y_{m,t})$  and  $(Y_t)$  are bounded. If  $Y_m$  is increasing (or decreasing) in  $m$ , then

$$\sup_t |Y_{m,t} - Y_t| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{almost surely}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T |Z_{m,s} - Z_s|^2 ds \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

**Remark 5.8** Note that if  $f$  satisfies (5.9)–(5.11), then Proposition 5.7 holds without the assumption that  $Y_m$  is increasing or decreasing in  $m$ . Indeed, by Theorem 5.5 the comparison principle is valid. In particular,  $Y(\xi_1) \geq Y(\xi_2)$  for  $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2$  (where  $Y(\xi)$  denotes the solution of the BSDE with driver  $f$  and terminal condition  $\xi$ ). Now define  $\hat{\xi}_m = \sup_{n \geq m} \xi_n$  and  $\tilde{\xi}_m = \inf_{n \geq m} \xi_n$ . Then

$$Y_t(\hat{\xi}_m) \geq Y_t(\xi_m) \geq Y_t(\tilde{\xi}_m).$$

By Proposition 5.7, one has  $\sup_t |Y_t(\hat{\xi}_m) - Y_t(\xi)| \rightarrow 0$  and  $\sup_t |Y_t(\tilde{\xi}_m) - Y_t(\xi)| \rightarrow 0$  almost surely, and therefore also  $\sup_t |Y_t(\xi_m) - Y_t(\xi)| \rightarrow 0$  almost surely. The convergence of the  $Z(\xi_m)$  to  $Z(\xi)$  now follows exactly as in the proof of Proposition 2.4 in Koblanski (2000).

**Theorem 5.9** Assume the  $(W_t^N)$  satisfy (W1) for some  $q \in [1, 2)$ , the  $f^N$  fulfill (f1)–(f5) and  $f$  satisfies (5.9)–(5.11). Let  $\xi$  be an  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable terminal condition bounded by  $C \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Then there exist  $\mathcal{F}_T^N$ -measurable  $\tilde{\xi}^N$  bounded by  $C$  and converging almost surely to  $\xi$  such that

$$\sup_t \left( |\tilde{Y}_t^N - Y_t| + \left| \int_0^t \tilde{Z}_s^N dW_s^N - \int_0^t Z_s dW_s \right| + |\tilde{M}_t^N| \right) \xrightarrow{(N \rightarrow \infty)} 0 \quad \text{in } L^2 \quad (5.12)$$

and

$$\sup_t \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \left| \int_0^t \tilde{Z}_s^{N,k} d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t Z_s^k ds \right|^2 + \left| \int_0^t |\tilde{Z}_s^N|^2 d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t |Z_s|^2 ds \right| \right) \xrightarrow{(N \rightarrow \infty)} 0 \quad \text{in } L^1, \quad (5.13)$$

where  $(Y_t, Z_t)$  solves the BSDE (2.2) and  $(\tilde{Y}_t^N, \tilde{Z}_t^N, \tilde{M}_t^N)$  is a solution of the  $N$ -th BSDE with terminal condition  $\tilde{\xi}^N$ . Moreover, if  $\xi = \varphi(W_{s_1}, \dots, W_{s_n})$  and  $\xi^N = \varphi(W_{s_1}^N, \dots, W_{s_n}^N)$  for a uniformly continuous function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , then

$$\sup_t |Y_t^N - Y_t| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$  is a solution of the  $N$ -th BSDE with terminal condition  $\xi^N$ .

*Proof.* Given an  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable random variable  $\xi$  bounded by  $C$ , there exists a sequence  $n_m, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , of positive integers together with times  $0 \leq s_1^m, \dots, s_{n_m}^m \leq T$  and Lipschitz-continuous functions  $\varphi_m : \mathbb{R}^{d \times n(m)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  bounded by  $C$  such that the random variables  $\xi_m = \varphi_m(W_{s_1}, \dots, W_{s_{n(m)}})$  converge to  $\xi$  almost surely. From Theorem 5.5 we know that there exist solutions  $(Y_t, Z_t)$  and  $(Y_{m,t}, Z_{m,t})$  to the BSDEs corresponding to  $(f, \xi)$  and  $(f, \xi_m)$ , respectively, and for  $N$  large enough, Proposition 3.3 guarantees a solution  $(Y_{m,t}^N, Z_{m,t}^N, M_{m,t}^N)$  to the  $N$ -th BSDE with driver  $f^N$  and terminal condition  $\xi_m^N = \varphi_m(W_{s_1}^N, \dots, W_{s_{n(m)}}^N)$ . Since for fixed  $m$ ,  $\varphi_m$  is bounded and Lipschitz, we can apply Lemma 5.4 and choose  $N_m \in \mathbb{N}$  increasing in  $m$  such that for all  $N \geq N_m$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_t \left( |Y_{m,t}^N - Y_{m,t}|^2 + \left| \int_0^t Z_{m,s}^N dW_s^N - \int_0^t Z_{m,s} dW_s \right|^2 + |M_{m,t}^N|^2 \right. \right. \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^d \left| \int_0^t Z_{m,s}^{N,k} d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t Z_{m,s}^k ds \right|^2 \\ & \left. \left. + \left| \int_0^t |Z_{m,s}^N|^2 d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t |Z_{m,s}|^2 ds \right| \right) \right] \leq \frac{1}{m}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $m_N$  be the largest  $m$  satisfying  $N_m \leq N$  and set  $\tilde{\xi}^N = \xi_{m_N}^N$ . Then  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} m_N = \infty$ , and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_t \left( |\tilde{Y}_t^N - Y_{m_N,t}|^2 + \left| \int_0^t \tilde{Z}_s^N dW_s^N - \int_0^t Z_{m_N,s} dW_s \right|^2 + |\tilde{M}_t^N|^2 \right. \right. \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^d \left| \int_0^t \tilde{Z}_s^{N,k} d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t Z_{m_N,s}^k ds \right|^2 \\ & \left. \left. + \left| \int_0^t |\tilde{Z}_s^N|^2 d\langle W^N \rangle_s - \int_0^t |Z_{m_N,s}|^2 ds \right| \right) \right] \stackrel{(N \rightarrow \infty)}{\rightarrow} 0. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\tilde{M}_t^N| \stackrel{(N \rightarrow \infty)}{\rightarrow} 0 \quad \text{in } L^2.$$

Moreover, by Proposition 5.7 and Remark 5.8,

$$\sup_t |Y_{m_N,t} - Y_t| \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^2, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T |Z_{m_N,s} - Z_s|^2 ds \right] \rightarrow 0,$$

and the first part of the theorem follows.

If

$$\xi = \varphi(W_{s_1}, \dots, W_{s_n}) \quad \text{and} \quad \xi^N = \varphi(W_{s_1}^N, \dots, W_{s_n}^N)$$

for a uniformly continuous function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  bounded by  $C$ , there exist Lipschitz-continuous functions  $\varphi_m : \mathbb{R}^{d \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  again bounded by  $C$  such that  $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}} |\varphi_m(x) - \varphi(x)| \leq 1/m$ . Choose  $m_N$  as in the first part of the proof and set

$$\tilde{\xi}^N = \varphi_{m_N}(W_{s_1}^N, \dots, W_{s_n}^N).$$

One then obtains as above that

$$\sup_t |\tilde{Y}_t^N - Y_t| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

By Lemma 5.1, there exists an  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and a constant  $D \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for  $N \geq N_0$ ,

$$\sup_t |Y_t^N - \tilde{Y}_t^N| \leq D \|\xi^N - \tilde{\xi}^N\|_\infty.$$

Hence,

$$\sup_t |Y_t^N - \tilde{Y}_t^N| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2 \quad \text{for } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

and one can conclude that

$$\sup_t |Y_t^N - Y_t| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2 \quad \text{for } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

□

In the following corollary we denote by  $C^d[0, T]$  the set of all continuous functions from  $[0, T]$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and assume that the driver  $f$  is of the form

$$f(t, y, z) = \tilde{f}(t, W, y, z) \tag{5.14}$$

for a measurable function  $\tilde{f} : [0, T] \times C^d[0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that is left-continuous in  $t$  and satisfies (5.9)–(5.11) as well as

$$|\tilde{f}(t, w_1, y, z) - \tilde{f}(t, w_2, y, z)| \leq L \sup_{s \leq t} |w_1(s) - w_2(s)|$$

for some constant  $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . To define the drivers  $f^N$ , we approximate  $(W_t^N)$  with continuous processes by setting  $\tau^N = \sup_i |t_i^N - t_{i-1}^N|$  and for all  $0 \leq t \leq T$ ,

$$W_t^{N,c} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } t \leq \tau^N \\ W_{t_{i-1}^N}^N + \frac{t - (t_{i-1}^N + \tau^N)}{t_i^N - t_{i-1}^N} (W_{t_i^N}^N - W_{t_{i-1}^N}^N) & \text{for } t_{i-1}^N + \tau^N \leq t \leq t_i^N + \tau^N. \end{cases}$$

Then  $(W_t^{N,c})$  is adapted to  $(\mathcal{F}_t^N)$  and

$$\sup_t |W_t^{N,c} - W_t| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2 \quad \text{for } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now define  $f^N$  by

$$f^N(t, W^N, y, z) = \tilde{f}(t_{i+1}^N, W^{c,N}, y, z) \quad \text{for } t_i^N < t \leq t_{i+1}^N. \tag{5.15}$$

By construction,  $f^N(t_{i+1}^N, W^N, y, z)$  only depends on  $W_{t_1}^N, \dots, W_{t_i}^N$  and one obtains the following:

**Corollary 5.10** Assume the  $(W_t^N)$  fulfill (A1), (A2) and (W1), but instead of (A3) they converge to  $(W_t)$  in distribution and satisfy  $\sup_N \mathbb{E} [\sup_t |W_t^N|^{2+\varepsilon}] < \infty$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Furthermore, suppose  $f$  and  $f^N$  are of the form (5.14) and (5.15), respectively. Then for every  $\xi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$ , there exists a sequence of random variables  $\xi^N \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T^N)$  such that  $(Y_t^N)$  converges in distribution to  $(Y_t)$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$  solves the  $N$ -th BSDEs corresponding to  $(f^N, \xi^N)$  and  $(Y_t, Z_t)$  is a solution of the BSDE with driver  $f$  and terminal condition  $\xi$ . Moreover, if  $\xi = \varphi(W_{s_1}, \dots, W_{s_n})$  for a uniformly continuous function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , one can choose  $\xi^N = \varphi(W_{s_1}^N, \dots, W_{s_n}^N)$ .

*Proof.* It can be shown as in Example 2.1 that there exists a probability space  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$  supporting a  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion  $(\tilde{W}_t)$  and random walks  $(\tilde{W}_t^N)$  with the same distributions as  $(W_t^N)$  such that  $\mathbb{E} [\sup_t |\tilde{W}_t^N - \tilde{W}_t|^2] \rightarrow 0$  for  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Since

$$\sup_t |\tilde{f}(t, \tilde{W}^{N,c}, y, z) - \tilde{f}(t, \tilde{W}, y, z)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2 \text{ for } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

it follows from Theorem 5.9 that for every  $\tilde{\xi} \in L^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_T)$  one can choose terminal conditions  $\tilde{\xi}^N \in L^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_T^N)$  such that the corresponding solutions satisfy  $\sup_t |\tilde{Y}_t^N - \tilde{Y}_t| \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^2$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore, if  $\tilde{\xi}$  is of the form  $\tilde{\xi} = \varphi(\tilde{W}_{s_1}, \dots, \tilde{W}_{s_n})$  for a uniformly continuous function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , one can choose  $\tilde{\xi}^N = \varphi(\tilde{W}_{s_1}^N, \dots, \tilde{W}_{s_n}^N)$ . This proves the corollary.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.11** In the setting of Corollary 5.10, let

$$\xi^N = \begin{cases} \sqrt{W_T^N} \wedge 1 & \text{if } W_T^N \geq 0 \\ -\sqrt{-W_T^N} \vee -1 & \text{if } W_T^N < 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi = \begin{cases} \sqrt{W_T} \wedge 1 & \text{if } W_T \geq 0 \\ -\sqrt{-W_T} \vee -1 & \text{if } W_T < 0. \end{cases}$$

Then  $(Y_t^N)$  converges in distribution to  $(Y_t)$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

## 6 Convergence results for convex drivers

In this section we consider BSDEs with drivers that are convex in  $z$  and derive convergence results using dual representations. Solutions of BSDEs with convex drivers have a dual representation; for the case where  $f$  does not depend on  $y$ , see for instance Theorem 7.4 in Barrieu and El Karoui (2009), Theorems 2.1–2.2 in Delbaen et al. (2009) or the discussion in Delbaen et al. (2008). Here we establish a dual representation for solutions of BSDEs and use it to show convergence. We need the following assumption on the approximating processes  $(W_t^N)$ :

(W2)  $\mathbb{E} [\Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N,k} \Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N,l}] = 0$  for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, i_N$ ,  $k \neq l$  and

$$\sup_{N,i,k} \frac{\|\Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N,k}\|_\infty}{\sqrt{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N}}} < \infty.$$

Note that this implies (W1) for all  $q \in [1, 2)$ . In the following we assume that the drivers  $f^N$  are convex in  $z$  and define

$$g^N(t, y, \mu) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_z \{ \mu z - f^N(t, y, z) \}, \quad \mu \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Let  $(\mu_t^N)$  be an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued  $(\mathcal{F}_t^N)$ -adapted process which is constant on the intervals  $(t_{i-1}^N, t_i^N]$  and satisfies

$$\mu_{t_i^N}^N \Delta W_{t_i^N}^N > -1 \quad \text{for all } i. \quad (6.1)$$

Then

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}^{\mu^N}}{d\mathbb{P}} = \prod_{i=1}^{i_N} (1 + \mu_{t_i^N}^N \Delta W_{t_i^N}^N) \quad (6.2)$$

defines a probability measure  $\mathbb{P}^{\mu^N}$  equivalent to  $\mathbb{P}$  under which the processes

$$W_{t_i^N}^{N, \mu^N, k} = W_{t_i^N}^{N, k} - \sum_{j=1}^i \mu_{t_j^N}^k \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N}, \quad k = 1, \dots, d,$$

are martingales.

**Proposition 6.1** *Assume (W2) and let  $C, K, L \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $q \in [1, 2)$  be constants such that all terminal conditions  $\xi^N$  and drivers  $f^N$  fulfill the following conditions:*

- (i)  $\|\xi^N\|_\infty \leq C$
- (ii)  $f^N$  is convex in  $z$
- (iii)  $|f^N(t, y, z)| \leq K(1 + |y| + |z|^q)$  for all  $(t, y, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$
- (iv)  $|f^N(t, y_1, z) - f^N(t, y_2, z)| \leq L|y_1 - y_2|$  for all  $(t, y, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$
- (v)  $|f^N(t, y, z_1) - f^N(t, y, z_2)| \leq L(1 + (|z_1| \vee |z_2|)^{q/2})|z_1 - z_2|$   
for all  $(t, y, z_1, z_2) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$  such that  $|y| \leq (C + 1)\exp(KT)$ .

Then there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for every  $N \geq N_0$ , the  $N$ -th BSDE has a unique solution  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$  and  $(Y_t^N)$  can be represented as

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\mu^N} \mathbb{E}^{\mu^N} \left[ \xi^N - \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} g^N(t_j^N, Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \mu_{t_j^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right], \quad (6.3)$$

where the essential supremum is taken over all  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued  $(\mathcal{F}_t^N)$ -adapted processes  $(\mu_t^N)$  that are constant on the intervals  $(t_{i-1}^N, t_i^N]$  and satisfy (6.1). Moreover, there exists a constant  $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for each  $N \geq N_0$ , (6.3) admits a maximizer  $(\hat{\mu}_t^N)$  satisfying

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N|^2 \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \leq R \quad \text{for all } i \leq i_N - 1. \quad (6.4)$$

*Proof.* Set  $\bar{C} = (C + 1)\exp(KT)$  and denote

$$a = \sup_{N, i} \frac{\left\| |\Delta W_{t_i^N}^N| \right\|_\infty}{\sqrt{\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N}}} < \infty.$$



Choose  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $N \geq N_0$  the conclusion of Theorem 4.2 holds and

$$\sqrt{d}La(\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N})^{1/2} + d^{(2+q)/4}L\bar{C}^{q/2}a(\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N})^{(2-q)/4} < 1. \quad (6.5)$$

Then it follows from Theorem 4.2 that for fixed  $N \geq N_0$ , the  $N$ -th BSΔE has a unique solution  $(Y_t^N, Z_t^N, M_t^N)$  with  $|Y_t^N| \leq \bar{C}$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Now choose an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued  $(\mathcal{F}_t^N)$ -adapted process  $(\mu_t^N)$  that is constant on the intervals  $(t_{i-1}^N, t_i^N]$  and satisfies (6.1). It follows from the definition of  $g^N$  that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{t_i^N}^N &= \xi^N + \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} f^N(t_j^N, Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, Z_{t_j^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} - \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} Z_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N - (M_T^N - M_{t_i^N}^N) \\ &\geq \xi^N - \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} g^N(t_j^N, Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \mu_{t_j^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} - \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} Z_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^{N, \mu^N} - (M_T^N - M_{t_i^N}^N). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $(M_t^N)$  is orthogonal to  $(W_t^N)$ , its components are still martingales under  $P^{\mu^N}$ , and one obtains

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N \geq \mathbb{E}^{\mu^N} \left[ \xi^N - \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} g^N(t_j^N, Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \mu_{t_j^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right]. \quad (6.6)$$

By Lemma 6.2 below, there exists for each  $i$  a  $\hat{\mu}_{t_i^N}^N \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}^N}^N)^d$  such that

$$f^N(t_i^N, Y_{t_{i-1}^N}^N, Z_{t_i^N}^N + z) - f^N(t_i^N, Y_{t_{i-1}^N}^N, Z_{t_i^N}^N) \geq z \hat{\mu}_{t_i^N}^N \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Set  $\hat{\mu}_t^N = \hat{\mu}_{t_i^N}^N$  for  $t \in (t_{i-1}^N, t_i^N]$ . Then  $(\hat{\mu}_t^N)$  is a left-continuous  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued  $(\mathcal{F}_t^N)$ -adapted process such that

$$f^N(t_i^N, Y_{t_{i-1}^N}^N, Z_{t_i^N}^N) + g^N(t_i^N, Y_{t_{i-1}^N}^N, \hat{\mu}_{t_i^N}^N) = \hat{\mu}_{t_i^N}^N Z_{t_i^N}^N \quad \text{for all } i. \quad (6.7)$$

So if we can show that  $(\hat{\mu}_t^N)$  satisfies (6.1) and (6.4), the equality in (6.6) becomes an equality and the Proposition is proved. To see that  $(\hat{\mu}_t^N)$  satisfies (6.1), note that it follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_{t_i^N}^{N,k}| &= \left| (\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N})^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_{t_{i-1}^N}^N \Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N,k} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}^N}^N \right] \right| \\ &\leq \left| (\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N})^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ |Y_{t_{i-1}^N}^N|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}^N}^N \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ |\Delta W_{t_i^N}^{N,k}|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}^N}^N \right]} \right| \\ &\leq \bar{C} (\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N})^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore,

$$|Z_{t_i^N}^N| \leq \sqrt{d} \bar{C} (\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N})^{-1/2}. \quad (6.8)$$

From condition (v) one obtains

$$|\hat{\mu}_{t_i^N}^{N,k}| \leq L(1 + |Z_{t_i^N}^N|^{q/2}) \quad \text{for all } k.$$

Hence, it follows from estimate (6.8) that

$$|\hat{\mu}_{t_i^N}^N| \leq \sqrt{d}L(1 + |Z_{t_i^N}^N|^{q/2}) \leq \sqrt{d}L + d^{(2+q)/4}L\bar{C}^{q/2}(\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N})^{-q/4}.$$

This gives

$$|\hat{\mu}_{t_i^N}^N \Delta W_{t_i^N}^N| \leq |\hat{\mu}_{t_i^N}^N| |\Delta W_{t_i^N}^N| \leq \sqrt{d} L a (\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N})^{1/2} + d^{(2+q)/4} L \bar{C}^{q/2} a (\Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N})^{(2-q)/4} < 1$$

and shows that  $(\hat{\mu}_t^N)$  satisfies condition (6.1).

To show (6.4), we first assume  $q = 1$ . Then one has

$$\begin{aligned} g^N(t_j^N, Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N) &= \operatorname{ess\,sup}_z \{ \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N z - f^N(t_j^N, Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, z) \} \\ &\geq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_z \{ \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N z - K(1 + |Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| + |z|) \}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$|\hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^{N,k}| \leq K \quad \text{for all } k = 1, \dots, d,$$

and it is clear that  $(\hat{\mu}_t^N)$  satisfies condition (6.4). If  $q \in (1, 2)$ , denote  $|x|_q = (\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i|^q)^{1/q}$ , and observe that there exist constants  $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} g^N(t_j^N, Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N) &= \operatorname{ess\,sup}_z \{ \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N z - f^N(t_{j+1}^N, Y_{t_j^N}^N, z) \} \\ &\geq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_z \{ \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N z - K(1 + |Y_{t_j^N}^N| + |z|^q) \} \geq -K(1 + |Y_{t_j^N}^N|) + \operatorname{ess\,sup}_z \{ \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N z - C_1 |z|_q^q \} \\ &= -K(1 + |Y_{t_j^N}^N|) + C_2 |\hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N|_{q/(q-1)}^{q/(q-1)} \geq -K(1 + |Y_{t_j^N}^N|) + C_3 (|\hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N|^2 + 1). \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

Since

$$Y_{t_i^N}^N = \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mu}^N} \left[ \xi^N - \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} g^N(t_j^N, Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right]$$

and  $\xi^N$  and  $Y_t^N$  are bounded by  $C$  and  $\bar{C}$ , respectively, one obtains

$$\mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mu}^N} \left[ \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} g^N(t_j^N, Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \leq C + \bar{C}.$$

This together with (6.9) and the uniform boundedness of  $(Y_t^N)$  shows that  $(\hat{\mu}_t^N)$  fulfills (6.4).  $\square$

**Lemma 6.2** *Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow L^0(\mathcal{F})$  be a function such that*

$$f(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) \leq \lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)f(y) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1.$$

*Then for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists  $Z \in L^0(\mathcal{F})^d$  such that*

$$f(x + y) - f(x) \geq yZ \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and denote by  $e_1, \dots, e_d$  the canonical basis in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We construct  $Z^1, \dots, Z^d \in L^0(\mathcal{F})$  inductively. First define the mapping  $p : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow L^0(\mathcal{F})$  by

$$p(y) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n[f(x + y/n) - f(x)]$$

and observe that

$$p(y) \leq f(x+y) - f(x) \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (6.10)$$

$$p(\lambda y) = \lambda p(y) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \geq 0 \text{ and } y \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (6.11)$$

$$p(y+z) \leq p(y) + p(z) \quad \text{for all } y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (6.12)$$

By (6.10) and (6.12), one has  $p(y) < \infty$  and  $p(y) \geq p(0) - p(-y) > -\infty$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . So  $p$  maps  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $L^0(\mathcal{F})$ . Now set  $Z^1 = p(e_1)$  and then inductively,

$$Z^j = \text{ess inf} \left\{ p \left( e_j + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} y_i e_i \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} y_i Z^i : y_1, \dots, y_{j-1} \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \quad \text{for } j \geq 2.$$

By (6.10), it is enough to show that  $Z$  belongs to  $L^0(\mathcal{F})^d$  and

$$p(y) \geq yZ \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (6.13)$$

It is clear that  $Z^1 \in L^0(\mathcal{F})$  and it follows from (6.11) and (6.12) that  $p(y_1 e_1) \geq y_1 Z^1$  for all  $y_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Now assume that  $Z^1, \dots, Z^{j-1}$  are in  $L^0(\mathcal{F})$  and

$$p \left( \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} y_i e_i \right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} y_i Z^i \quad \text{for all } y_1, \dots, y_{j-1} \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (6.14)$$

Then one deduces from (6.11) and (6.12) that for all  $y_1, \dots, y_{j-1} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y_j > 0$ ,

$$p \left( y_j e_j + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} y_i e_i \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} y_i Z^i = y_j \left[ p \left( e_j + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{y_i}{y_j} e_i \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{y_i}{y_j} Z^i \right] \geq y_j Z^j.$$

Moreover, it follows from (6.14) that for all  $v_1, \dots, v_{j-1} \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$p \left( e_j + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} y_i e_i \right) + p \left( -e_j + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} v_i e_i \right) \geq p \left( \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (y_i + v_i) e_i \right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (y_i + v_i) Z^i,$$

and therefore,

$$p \left( e_j + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} y_i e_i \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} y_i Z^i \geq -p \left( -e_j + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} v_i e_i \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} v_i Z^i.$$

Hence,

$$Z^j \geq -p \left( -e_j + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} v_i e_i \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} v_i Z^i,$$

and one obtains for  $y_j < 0$ ,

$$p \left( y_j e_j + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} y_i e_i \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} y_i Z^i = |y_j| \left[ p \left( -e_j + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{y_i}{|y_j|} e_i \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{y_i}{|y_j|} Z^i \right] \geq y_j Z^j.$$

This shows that  $Z^j$  is in  $L^0(\mathcal{F})$  and

$$p \left( \sum_{i=1}^j y_i e_i \right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^j y_i Z^i \quad \text{for all } y_1, \dots, y_j \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The lemma now follows by induction. □

**Lemma 6.3** *Let  $(\mu_t)$  be an  $(\mathcal{F}_t^N)$ -adapted process that is constant on the intervals  $(t_{i-1}^N, t_i^N]$  and satisfies (6.1). Then one has*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \mu_{t_j^N} \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) \log \left( \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \mu_{t_j^N} \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \leq \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\mu_{t_j^N}|^2 \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right].$$

*Proof.* One can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \mu_{t_j^N} \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) \log \left( \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \mu_{t_j^N} \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ \log(1 + \mu_{t_j^N} \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \leq \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} \log \left( \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ (1 + \mu_{t_j^N} \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from Jensen's inequality. The right-hand side can be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} \log \left\{ 1 + \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ \mu_{t_j^N}^k \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ \Delta W_{t_j^N}^{N,k} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N \right] \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \right\} \\ &= \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} \log \left\{ 1 + \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ (\mu_{t_j^N}^k)^2 \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \right\} \leq \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ |\mu_{t_j^N}|^2 \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The equality holds because

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ \Delta W_{t_j^N}^{N,k} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N \right] = \mu_{t_j^N}^k \Delta \langle W_{t_j^N}^N \rangle.$$

For the inequality we used  $\log(1+x) \leq x$ . □

In the following lemma we show a discrete Gronwall result which we will need later.

**Lemma 6.4** *For all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $(X_t^N)$  be a stochastic process that is constant on the intervals  $[t_i^N, t_{i+1}^N)$ . Assume there exist constants  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that*

$$|X_T^N| \leq a \quad \text{and} \quad |X_{t_i^N}^N| \leq a + b \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |X_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \quad \text{for all } N \text{ and } i \leq i_N - 1.$$

*Then there exists an  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$|X_{t_i^N}^N| \leq 2a \exp(b(T - t_i^N)) \quad \text{for all } N \geq N_0 \text{ and } i = 0, \dots, i_N.$$

*Proof.* For  $N$  so large that  $\sup_i \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_i^N} < 1/b$ , the deterministic process given by

$$\hat{X}_T^N = a \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{X}_t^N = a \prod_{j: t_j^N > t} (1 - b \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N})^{-1}, \quad t < T,$$

solves

$$\hat{X}_{t_i^N}^N = a + b \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} \hat{X}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \quad \text{for all } i \leq i_N - 1$$

and converges uniformly to  $a \exp\{b(T-t)\}$ . Thus, there exists an  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\hat{X}_{t_i^N}^N \leq 2a \exp\{b(T-t_i^N)\}$$

for all  $N \geq N_0$  and  $i = 0, \dots, i_N$ . The lemma follows if we can show that  $|X_{t_i^N}^N| \leq \hat{X}_{t_i^N}^N$  for all  $N \geq N_0$  and  $i$ . For  $i = i_N$ , this is obvious, and if it holds for  $j \geq i+1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} |X_{t_i^N}^N| &\leq \frac{a + b \sum_{j=i+2}^{i_N} |X_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N}}{1 - b \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}} \\ &\leq \frac{a + b \sum_{j=i+2}^{i_N} \hat{X}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N}}{1 - b \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_{i+1}^N}} = \hat{X}_{t_i^N}^N. \end{aligned}$$

□

We are now ready to prove our convergence result for convex drivers:

**Theorem 6.5** *Assume (W2), the  $f^N(t, y, z)$  are convex in  $z$  and one has  $\sup_N \|\xi^N\|_\infty < \infty$  and  $\xi^N \rightarrow \xi$  in  $L^2$ . Moreover, suppose that the  $f^N$  and  $f$  satisfy (f1)–(f5) and (5.9)–(5.11) with the same constant  $K \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Then*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Y_t^N - Y_t| \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^2 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 5.9 there exist  $\mathcal{F}_T^N$ -measurable terminal conditions  $\tilde{\xi}^N$  bounded by  $C = \sup_N \|\xi^N\|_\infty$  and converging to  $\xi$  in  $L^2$  such that the corresponding sequence of solutions  $(\tilde{Y}_t^N)$  satisfies

$$\sup_t |\tilde{Y}_t^N - Y_t| \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^2.$$

Choose  $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that condition (f3) holds for  $a = (C+1) \exp(KT)$ . Then the conditions of Theorem 4.2 and Proposition 6.1 are satisfied with  $L = K \vee b$ . Hence, there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $N \geq N_0$ ,  $\sup_t |Y_t^N|$  and  $\sup_t |\tilde{Y}_t^N|$  are bounded by  $(C+1) \exp(KT)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{t_i^N}^N &= \operatorname{ess\,sup}_\mu \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ \xi^N - \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} g^N(t_j^N, Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \mu_{t_j^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mu}^N} \left[ \xi^N - \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} g^N(t_j^N, Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Y}_{t_i^N}^N &= \operatorname{ess\,sup}_\mu \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ \tilde{\xi}^N - \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} g^N(t_j^N, \tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \mu_{t_j^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mu}^N} \left[ \tilde{\xi}^N - \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} g^N(t_j^N, \tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \tilde{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If we can show

$$\sup_t |\tilde{Y}_t^N - Y_t^N| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2,$$

we get

$$\sup_t |Y_t^N - Y_t| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2,$$

and the theorem is proved. As the supremum of  $K$ -Lipschitz functions,  $g^N$  is again  $K$ -Lipschitz in  $y$ . Hence, since  $|\max\{a_1, a_2\} - \max\{b_1, b_2\}| \leq \max\{|a_1 - b_1|, |a_2 - b_2|\}$  for  $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{t_i}^N &= \max_{\mu \in \{\hat{\mu}^N, \tilde{\mu}^N\}} \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ \xi^N - \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} g^N(t_j^N, Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \mu_{t_j^N}) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\ \tilde{Y}_{t_i}^N &= \max_{\mu \in \{\hat{\mu}^N, \tilde{\mu}^N\}} \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ \tilde{\xi}^N - \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} g^N(t_j^N, \tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N, \mu_{t_j^N}) \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right], \end{aligned}$$

one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{Y}_{t_i}^N - Y_{t_i}^N| &\leq \max_{\mu \in \{\hat{\mu}^N, \tilde{\mu}^N\}} \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[ |\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| + K \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mu}^N} \left[ |\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| + K \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mu}^N} \left[ |\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| + K \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right]. \end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 6.1 we know that there exists a constant  $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mu}^N} \left[ \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N|^2 \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \leq R \quad \text{for all } N \geq N_0 \text{ and } i = 0, \dots, i_N - 1.$$

Thus, we can deduce from Lemma 6.3 that there exists a constant  $\tilde{R} \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \varphi \left( \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) \right) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \leq \tilde{R} \quad \text{for all } N \geq N_0 \text{ and } i = 0, \dots, i_N - 1,$$

where  $\varphi(x) = x \log(x) \vee 1$ . Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and set  $D = 2[C + (C + 1) \exp(KT)K \sup_{N \geq N_0} \langle W^N \rangle_T]$ . Since  $\varphi(x)/x \uparrow \infty$ , there exists  $B \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $x > B$ ,

$$\frac{x}{\varphi(x)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\tilde{R}D}.$$

Define the sets  $E_{i+1}^N$  by  $E_{i+1}^N = \{\prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) > B\}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{N \geq N_0, 0 \leq i \leq i_N - 1} \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{E_{i+1}^N} \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\
&= \sup_{N \geq N_0, 0 \leq i \leq i_N - 1} \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{E_{i+1}^N} \frac{\prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N)}{\varphi(\prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N))} \varphi(\prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N)) | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\tilde{R}D} \sup_{N \geq N_0, 0 \leq i \leq i_N - 1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \varphi(\prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N)) | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{D}. \tag{6.15}
\end{aligned}$$

This yields for all  $N \geq N_0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mu}^N} \left[ |\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| + K \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) (|\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| + K \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N}) | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{E_{i+1}^N} \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) (|\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| + K \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N}) | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{E_{i+1}^{N,c}} \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) (|\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| + K \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N}) | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\
&\leq D \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{E_{i+1}^N} \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{E_{i+1}^{N,c}} \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_N} (1 + \hat{\mu}_{t_j^N}^N \Delta W_{t_j^N}^N) (|\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| + K \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N}) | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \\
&\leq \varepsilon + B \mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| + K \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right].
\end{aligned}$$

In the first inequality we used that the random variables  $|\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| + K \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N}$  are uniformly bounded by  $D$ . In the second inequality we used (6.15) and the definition of the sets  $E_{i+1}^N$ . Using the same estimate for  $\tilde{\mu}^N$  instead of  $\hat{\mu}^N$  gives

$$|\tilde{Y}_{t_i^N}^N - Y_{t_i^N}^N| \leq 2\varepsilon + 2B \mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| + K \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right]. \tag{6.16}$$

Taking expectations, one gets

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{Y}_{t_i^N}^N - Y_{t_i^N}^N| \right] \leq 2\varepsilon + 2B \mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| \right] + K \sum_{j=i+1}^{i_N} \mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \right] \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N}.$$

From Lemma 6.4 one then obtains an  $N_1 \geq N_0$  such that for all  $N \geq N_1$  and  $i = 0, \dots, i_N$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{Y}_{t_i^N}^N - Y_{t_i^N}^N| \right] \leq 4 \left( \varepsilon + B \mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| \right] \right) \exp\{K(T - t_i^N)\}.$$

Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, it follows that

$$\sup_t \mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{Y}_t^N - Y_t^N| \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

and since  $(Y_t^N)$  and  $(\tilde{Y}_t^N)$  are both bounded by  $(C + 1) \exp(KT)$ , also

$$\sup_t \mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{Y}_t^N - Y_t^N|^2 \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.17)$$

Moreover, it follows from (6.16) that

$$\sup_i |\tilde{Y}_{t_i^N}^N - Y_{t_i^N}^N| \leq 2\varepsilon + 2B \left( \sup_i \mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] + K \sup_i A_{t_i^N}^N \right).$$

for the non-negative martingale

$$A_{t_i^N}^N = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right], \quad i = 0, \dots, i_N.$$

Since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary, and  $\sup_i \mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{\xi}^N - \xi^N| | \mathcal{F}_{t_i^N}^N \right] \xrightarrow{(N \rightarrow \infty)} 0$  in  $L^2$  by Doob's maximal inequality, the only thing left to show is  $\sup_i A_{t_i^N}^N \xrightarrow{(N \rightarrow \infty)} 0$  in  $L^2$ . Applying Doob's maximal inequality to  $(A_t^N)$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_i |A_{t_i^N}^N|^2 \right] &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{j=1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N| \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2 \langle W^N \rangle_T \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{i_N} |\tilde{Y}_{t_{j-1}^N}^N - Y_{t_{j-1}^N}^N|^2 \Delta \langle W^N \rangle_{t_j^N} \right] \\ &\leq 2(\langle W^N \rangle_T)^2 \sup_t \mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{Y}_t^N - Y_t^N|^2 \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Jensen's inequality for the second inequality and (6.17) for the convergence in the last line. This proves the theorem.  $\square$

If one has convergence of  $(W^N, \xi^N)$  to  $(W, \xi)$  in distribution instead of  $L^2$  together with

$$\sup_N \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_t |W_t^N|^{2+\varepsilon} \right] < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_N \|\xi^N\|_\infty < \infty,$$

one can show as in Example 2.1 that there exists a probability space  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$  carrying  $(\tilde{W}^N, \tilde{\xi}^N)$  distributed as  $(W^N, \xi^N)$  and  $(\tilde{W}, \tilde{\xi})$  distributed as  $(W, \xi)$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_t |\tilde{W}_t^N - \tilde{W}_t|^2 \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{\xi}^N - \tilde{\xi}|^2 \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

In the case where the drivers  $f$  and  $f^N$  are given as in (5.14) and (5.15), the following holds:



**Corollary 6.6** *Assume the  $(W_t^N)$  fulfill (A1), (A2) and (W2), but instead of (A3),  $(W^N, \xi^N)$  converges in distribution to  $(W, \xi)$  and one has  $\sup_N \mathbb{E} [\sup_t |W_t^N|^{2+\varepsilon}] < \infty$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\sup_N \|\xi^N\|_\infty < \infty$ . Furthermore, suppose  $f$  and  $f^N$  are of the form (5.14) and (5.15), respectively. Then  $Y^N$  converges in distribution to  $Y$ .*

## References

- V. Bally (1997). Approximation scheme for solutions of BSDE. Backward stochastic differential equations (N. El Karoui and L. Mazliak, eds.), Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., 364, Longman, Harlow, 177–191.
- P. Barrieu and N. El Karoui (2009). Pricing, hedging and optimally designing derivatives via minimization of risk measures. Volume on Indifference Pricing (René Carmona, ed.), Princeton University Press.
- B. Bouchard and N. Touzi (2004). Discrete-time approximation and Monte-Carlo simulation of backward stochastic differential equations. Stoch. Proc. Appl. 111, 175–206.
- P. Briand, B. Delyon and J. Mémin (2001). Donsker-type theorem for BSDEs. Electron. Commun. Probab. 6, 1–14.
- P. Briand, B. Delyon and J. Mémin (2002). On the robustness of backward stochastic differential equations. Stoch. Proc. Appl. 97, 229–253.
- P. Briand and Y. Hu (2006). BSDEs with quadratic growth and unbounded terminal value. Probab. Th. Rel. Fields 136, 604–618.
- P. Briand and Y. Hu (2008). Quadratic BSDEs with convex generators and unbounded terminal conditions. Probab. Th. Rel. Fields 141, 543–567.
- D. Chevance (1997). Numerical methods for backward stochastic differential equations. Numerical Methods in Finance 232–244, Publ. Newton Inst., Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
- F. Coquet, V. Mackevicius and J. Mémin (1999). Corrigendum to ‘Stability in D of martingales and backward equations under discretization of filtration’. Stoch. Proc. Appl. 82, 332–335.
- F. Coquet, J. Mémin and L. Slomiński (2000). On weak convergence of filtrations. Séminaire de Probabilités. XXXV, Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin, 306–329.
- F. Delbaen, S. Peng, and E. Rosazza Gianin (2008). Representation of the penalty term of dynamic concave utilities. Preprint.
- F. Delbaen, Y. Hu, and X. Bao (2009). Backward SDEs with superquadratic growth. Preprint.
- J. Jr. Douglas, J. Ma and P. Protter (1996). Numerical methods for forwardbackward stochastic differential equations. Ann. Appl. Probab. 6, 940–968.
- N. El-Karoui, S. Pen and M.C. Quenez (1997). Backward stochastic differential equations in finance. Math. Finance 7, 1–71.
- E. Gobet, J.P. Lemor and X. Warin (2005). A regression-based Monte Carlo method to solve backward stochastic differential equations. Ann. Appl. Probab. 15, 2172–2202.
- N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe (1989). Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes. Ams-

terdam, North-Holland.

P. Imkeller and G. Reis (2009). Path regularity and explicit truncation order for BSDE with drivers of quadratic growth. Preprint.

M. Kobylanski (2000). Backward stochastic differential equations and partial differential equations with quadratic growth. *Ann. Probab.* 28, 558–602.

J. Ma, P. Protter and J. Yong (1994). Solving forward-backward stochastic differential equations explicitly—a four step scheme. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields* 98, 339–359.

J. Ma, P. Protter, J. San Martin and S. Torres (2002). Numerical methods for backward SDEs. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 12, 302–316.

M.A. Morlais (2009). Quadratic BSDEs driven by a continuous martingale. *Finance Stoch.* 13, 121–150.

M.E. Otmani (2006). Approximation scheme for solutions of backward stochastic differential equations via the representation theorem. *Ann. Math. Blaise Pascal* 13, 1, 17–29.

E. Pardoux and S. Peng (1990). Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation. *Syst. Contr. Lett.* 14, 1, 55–61.

S. Peng (2004). Nonlinear expectations. *Nonlinear Evaluations and Risk Measures. Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 1856, Springer Verlag.

S. Toldo (2006). Stability of solutions of BSDEs with random terminal time. *ESAIM Prob. Stat.* 10, 141–163.

S. Toldo (2007). Corrigendum to ‘Stability of solutions of BSDEs with random terminal time’, *ESAIM Prob. Stat.* 11, 381–384.

Y. Zhang (2004). A numerical scheme for BSDE. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 14, 1, 459–488.

Y. Zhang and W. Zheng (2002). Discretizing a backward stochastic differential equation. *Intern. J. Math. Mathematical Sc.* 32, 2, 103–116.